

Minutes



CENTRAL & South Planning Committee

13 October 2016

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

	<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, Beulah East and Brian Stead</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: Kate Boulter (Democratic Services Officer), Alex Chrusciak (Planning Service Manager), Meghji Hirani (Planning Contracts & Planning Information), Roisin Hogan (Planning Lawyer), Jyoti Mehta (Trainee Solicitor) and Syed Shah (Principal Highway Engineer)</p>
107.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies were received from Councillor Manjit Khatra, who was substituted by Councillor Beulah East.</p>
108.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>Councillor Janet Duncan declared a non-pecuniary interest in agenda item 8 and stated that she would leave the meeting during the discussion of the item.</p>
109.	<p>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>There were no minutes for approval.</p>
110.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
111.	<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> <p>It was confirmed that the items of business marked Part I would be considered in public, and items marked Part II would be considered in private.</p>
112.	<p>12 BEACON CLOSE, UXBRIDGE (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and provided an overview of the application. It was noted that corrected plans had been circulated and were provided in the officer's</p>

presentation.

No representative of the petitioner was present or indicated they wished to speak.

The agent for the applicant addressed the meeting and raised the following points:

- The property was currently tenanted and was not being used as a house in multiple occupation (HMO). The tenant would move out when the works were complete and the family which owned the property would move in.
- The number of cars at the property would reduce when the family occupied the house. There was sufficient space for vans and skip while the work was being carried out, and there was space for waste and recycling in the garage area.
- The extension had been reduced by 300mm either side, and the scheme had been amended to comply with the Council's policies.

In response to questions from Members, officers advised that:

- The correct plan numbers would be listed.
- No patio was shown on the plans, and permission would not be needed for a patio 300mm beyond unmade ground level.
- There was nothing in the application which suggested the applicant intended to use the property as an HMO.

A motion for approval subject to the correction of the plan numbers and an additional informative being added was moved and seconded. Upon being put to a vote, the motion was agreed unanimously.

RESOLVED: The application was approved as per the officer's recommendation subject to corrections to the plan numbers in Condition 2 and the addition of the following informative:

"This planning permission does not confer any approval for the construction of a new patio to the rear of the property. The applicant is advised that the creation of any patio which exceeds a height of 300mm above unmade, natural ground level would require planning permission.

113. **203 PARK ROAD, UXBRIDGE** (*Agenda Item 7*)

Officers introduced the report and provided an overview of the application. It was noted that a confidential personal statement from the applicant had been circulated to Members.

A petitioner, speaking in support of the application, raised the following points:

- The proposed building, which would be occupied by the applicant's grandparents, should be viewed as an extension to the main house rather than a separate dwelling.
- The main house did not currently have an extension.
- The grandparents would enter the property through the main house and there would be no separate curtilage. A planning condition could ensure that the building was ancillary to the main house.
- The footprint of the proposed building was under half the footprint of the existing dwelling.

In response to questions from Members, officers advised that the proposed height of 3.7m was within permitted development, but the proposed proximity to the boundary was closer than the 2m allowed for permitted development.

The following points were made by Members during discussion on the item:

- The plans showed trees on the land adjacent to the proposed building and it was not clear how these would be affected.
- There was some concern about the size and height of the building and the impact this would have on neighbours.

A motion for the application to be deferred to enable revised plans to be provided was moved and seconded. Upon being put to a vote, the motion was agreed unanimously.

RESOLVED: The application was deferred.

114. **45 FRAYS AVENUE, WEST DRAYTON** (*Agenda Item 8*)

Councillor Janet Duncan, having declared a non-pecuniary interest, left the meeting for consideration of this item.

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

A petitioner, speaking in objection to the application, raised the following points:

- The property was located in an area of special character and a flood area for the River Frays.
- The size and height of the proposed development was visually obtrusive and would cause overshadowing to the petitioner's patio.
- The description given in the application was inaccurate and misleading. They believed the property would have 6 bedrooms over 3 storeys. The house needed to be smaller and more in keeping with neighbouring properties.
- Moving the entrance to the driveway would cause disruption to neighbours.
- The property being demolished was likely to contain bats.

In response, the applicant raised the following points:

- The applicant had submitted two planning applications since 2014 and had sought extensive advice from the Planning Department before submitting the current application.
- Many neighbours had not signed the petition objecting to the development.
- The house would be a family home and its height would be no bigger than others in the street.
- The street had many different house styles and the proposed development complied with the Unitary Development Plan.
- No bats had been found in the property.

A Ward Councillor, speaking in objection, raised the following points:

- A new dwelling on the site was welcomed but it must fit into the street scene.
- The proposed development was considerably larger than others.

A Ward Councillor, speaking in support, raised the following points:

- The applicant had worked extensively with Planning and the new house would improve the street scene.
- The application was for a 4 bedroom property to replace a 5 bedroom property.
- There were no habitable rooms adjacent to number 47 Frays Avenue.

Officers advised that:

- The application represented a 7% increase in the footprint of the building. The overall size of the house would be larger due to the additional floors.
- The plans showed 45 degree angle taken from the midpoint of the nearest window.
- An overshadowing diagram had not been done.
- An informative could be added requiring a license if any protected species were found in the property.
- It was possible to walk out of the inset dormers.

The following points were made by Members during discussion on the item:

- There was concern regarding the possibility of overlooking from people walking out of the inset dormer windows, and that this feature could be out of character with the street scene.
- It would be helpful to see graphics clarifying measurements and visibility to and from the inset dormers windows.

A motion for the application to be deferred to enable further details to be sought in respect of the inset dormer windows was moved and seconded. Upon being put to a vote, the motion was agreed unanimously.

RESOLVED: The application was deferred.

115.	<p>544 UXBRIDGE ROAD, HAYES (<i>Agenda Item 9</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>RESOLVED: The application was approved as per the officer's recommendation.</p>
116.	<p>UNIT 4, HAMILTON CENTRE, BRUNEL UNIVERSITY (<i>Agenda Item 10</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>RESOLVED: The application was approved as per the officer's recommendation.</p>
117.	<p>UNIT 4, HAMILTON CENTRE, BRUNEL UNIVERSITY (<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>RESOLVED: The application was approved as per the officer's recommendation.</p>

118.	<p>GRANGE HOUSE, 9 GRANGE ROAD, HAYES (<i>Agenda Item 12</i>)</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and provided an overview of the application.</p> <p>Officers advised the Committee that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The property was a 7 bedroom House in Multiple Occupancy (HMO) and the standard parking requirement was 4 spaces. • The Highways Officer considered the parking space to be acceptable. <p>The following points were made by Members during discussion on the item:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was concern that the parking space provided might not be adequate depending upon how many people occupied the HMO. • Parking spaces needed to be independently accessible. <p>The officer recommendation for approval with an additional condition restricting the number of bedroom and occupants was moved, seconded, and upon being put to a vote was unanimously agreed.</p> <p>RESOLVED: The application was approved as per the officer's recommendation subject to the following amendments to Condition 5 to impose a limit on the maximum occupation of the premises:</p> <p>"The property shall only be used on the basis of multiple occupation with shared facilities and no more than seven letting bedrooms as indicated on the plans hereby approved and shall not be used at any time as self-contained units. Not more than seven persons shall occupy the premises at any time."</p>
119.	<p>39 STATION ROAD, WEST DRAYTON (<i>Agenda Item 13</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>RESOLVED: The application was approved as per the officer's recommendation.</p>
120.	<p>ENFORCEMENT REPORT (<i>Agenda Item 14</i>)</p> <p>RESOLVED: That (1) the enforcement action as recommended in the officer's report was agreed;</p> <p>(2) the Committee would 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>
121.	<p>ENFORCEMENT REPORT (<i>Agenda Item 15</i>)</p> <p>RESOLVED: That (1) the enforcement action as recommended in the officer's report was agreed;</p> <p>(2) the Committee would 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>

	The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 9.25 pm.

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Democratic Services on 01895 250833. 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.