

## Minutes



**CENTRAL & South Planning Committee**

**19 September 2017**

**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, Alan Chapman, Mo Khursheed, Peter Money and John Morse</p> <p><b>LBH Officers Present:</b> James Rodger - Head of Planning and Enforcement Meghji Hirani (Planning Contracts &amp; Planning Information) and Alan Tilly - transport and Aviation Manager Roisin Hogan - Planning Lawyer Neil Fraser - Democratic Services Officer</p>
90.	<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies were received from Councillor Brian Stead.</p>
91.	<p><b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING</b> (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
92.	<p><b>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING</b> (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b> That the minutes of the meeting held on 30 August 2017 be approved as a correct record.</p>
93.	<p><b>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
94.	<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 items on the agenda were Part 1, and would therefore be heard in public.</p>
95.	<p><b>LAND AT SANDOW CRESCENT - 879/APP/2017/1462</b> (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p><b>Seven x 3-bed dwellings with associated parking and amenity space</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the report, and provided a summary of the application.</p>

The Committee was informed that there were three main areas of concern that should be examined, namely: the principle of development, highways and parking issues, and the quality of the development.

Regarding the principle of development, it was highlighted that the development did not comply with London Plan minimum internal floorspace standards and did not represent efficient use of land given the strategic location of the site, which was within a Housing Zone. The proposed development was heavily constrained by the irregular shape of the site, and was below London Plan density standards which recommended 50 units per hectare for a suburban area.

While it was not expected that the development would have a material impact on traffic in the area, the site had very poor access, both from Nestles Avenue into Sandow Crescent, and from Sandow Crescent into the site. It was therefore considered that the site was not suitable for access by larger vehicles, including emergency service vehicles, and there were concerns regarding pedestrian and vehicle safety.

With respect to the quality of the accommodation provided, it was confirmed that the London Plan standards mandated 93sq.m of internal floorspace for a development of this size. This development provided 87sq.m of floorspace, and was therefore unacceptable.

The addendum was highlighted, and it was confirmed that since the publication of the officer's report, three additional responses had been received from occupiers in Sandow Crescent and Nestles Avenue, however these did not raise any issues that were not addressed within the report.

The applicant had attempted to address the reasons for refusal, and had discussed the development with the fire brigade, who had confirmed that the concerns regarding fire safety and emergency vehicle access could be overcome by the installation of safety sprinklers and fire hydrants. However, given the potential impact on pedestrian and highway safety, the Council's highways officer considered the access unsuitable, despite the installation of sprinklers and fire hydrants.

In addition, the applicant had asserted that the development was for a two storey, three bedroom dwelling, which required an internal floor area of 84 sq.m which complied with minimum standard of 87sq.m as set out in the London Plan. However, officers confirmed that the figures quoted by the applicant were for a two storey, 4 person unit. Officers considered that the room sizes within the dwellings were two storey, 5 person units, for which the minimum standard was 93sq.m. The proposal therefore did not comply with the London Plan requirements.

The applicant had approached the owners of the two sites that immediately adjoined the development site, and neither was interested in selling. Officers accepted the difficulty of the site assembly, however the density of the proposed development meant that the potential of the site, in a Housing Zone, was underutilised. It was requested that reference to point 3.4 of the London Plan policy be added to refusal reason 3, to further address this matter.

For these reasons, it was recommended that the application be refused.

A petitioner addressed the Committee in objection to the application, on behalf of petitioners and local residents. Concerns highlighted included the difficulty of vehicle access through what was a very narrow alleyway, often further restricted by parked

cars. It was asserted that current access required driving over neighbouring property, which had resulted in property damage to fencing.

In addition, the lack of vehicle access by emergency services in the event of a fire could lead to fire spreading to neighbouring properties, whilst refuse collections would not be available, which could exacerbate an existing rodent problem. The safety of children who played in the area was highlighted, as it was felt that they would be at risk of injury from vehicles using the area, whilst residents who leased garages would be affected.

Members sought clarity from the petitioner regarding how refuse collections from existing properties was currently being conducted. The petitioner confirmed that refuse bags were left at the corner of the road, as the refuse vehicles could not get into the Crescent.

The Head of Planning suggested that the wording of refusal reason 1 could be amended to make reference to refuse vehicles.

The Chairman opened the item for debate, and confirmed that the impact on residents leasing garages was not a consideration for the Committee.

Members shared the concerns raised by planning officers and the petitioner, particularly the lack of access to emergency services and refuse vehicles, and on this basis the officer's recommendation was moved. This was seconded, and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

**RESOLVED:**

- 1. That the application be refused; and**
- 2. That refusal reason 1 be amended to include reference to refuse vehicles.**

96. **GARAGE SITE 85/87 MANOR WAYE - 67593/APP/2017/2114** (*Agenda Item 7*)

**3 x two storey, two- bedroom dwellings with associated parking, landscaping and external works**

Officers introduced the report and provided an overview of the application. Considerations for the Committee included the parking provision, and the impact of the development on adjoining occupiers.

The development was confirmed to meet all Council standards in terms of car parking (with two parking spaces per residential unit), unit size, and amenity space provision. The development was confirmed to have no material impact on traffic within the area, and impact on adjoining occupiers was negligible, as the development met acceptable distance standards. The development would not result in any loss of amenity to neighbours.

The officer therefore recommended that the application be approved.

A petitioner addressed the Committee in objection to the application. The petitioner asserted that the development would result in overcrowding, and was not in keeping with the character of the area. Parking would be difficult for local residents, including elderly and disabled residents, one of whom relied on having sufficient space to use 'dial-a-ride' services, which would be unable to manoeuvre in a constrained space.

The constrained space would further impact the ability of emergency services, such as the fire brigade and air ambulance, to service the site.

The petitioner asserted that the plans outlined did not match the actual site dimensions, and that the development would result in significant overlooking and loss of privacy for neighbouring residents. Neighbours would be affected by noise, which could impact on their mental and physical wellbeing. In addition, parking in the area was already difficult, and these difficulties would be exacerbated were the development to proceed, particularly during the construction period.

There were two schools in the local area, and parents parked in the area in both in the morning and the afternoon. Children played in the local park. There were concerns that construction vehicles and additional traffic could impact on the safety of the children. In addition, trees in the area were very old, and should be retained.

The agent for the application addressed the Committee, confirming that the proposed development site was poor quality landfill ground, originally used for parking. The agent asserted that there was no policy protection to stop the applicant from seeking to improve the land.

With regard to potential overcrowding, the application met London Plan standards for houses, and Hillingdon standards for gardens and amenity space. Parking would be sufficient, with two parking spaces per unit. The Council's Highways engineer had deemed the space within the site to be sufficient for vehicles to access and manoeuvre, whilst wheelchair access was also provided.

There were no traffic safety issues arising from construction or the use of the dwellings, and there was no loss of amenity on adjoining occupiers. The loss of two trees would be mitigated by the planting of three new trees. For these reasons, the Committee was urged to uphold the officer's recommendation and grant approval.

Councillor Raymond Graham addressed the Committee, and confirmed that he accepted that the application complied with the relevant policies previously outlined. However, having visited the site, Councillor Graham raised concerns that the area would be overdeveloped, and that there would be highway, parking, and pedestrian pathway issues.

Councillor Graham suggested that the area would not be of sufficient size to allow for vehicle turning, which could be a significant issue for disabled drivers who lived in the area. Councillor Graham also raised concerns regarding tree protection and retention.

The Chairman summarised the points to be considered by the Committee before opening the item for debate. It was confirmed that the Committee could not refuse the application due to concerns over construction arrangements, and that the Committee was duty bound to observe the Council's policies and standards.

Members sought confirmation that the development would not result in overcrowding and poor living standards for the occupiers and neighbours. Planning officers confirmed that the proposal made provision for internal floor areas totalling 80 sq.m, which was in excess of the 79 sq.m required. The proposal therefore met amenity standards.

Regarding the petitioner's assertion that the plans were not correct, the planning officers confirmed that the plans had been checked against distances set out on maps of the area, and appeared to be correct. It was confirmed that, should the application be approved, the applicant would be required to build according to the plans. Further

planning permission would be required, should the applicant ever seek to vary the plans.

In response to concerns of overshadowing and loss of privacy, it was confirmed that there were to be no windows in the side elevations, and that the proposal met the 15m standard separation distances required by the Council.

It was requested that the plans for the previously approved scheme, dated 2011-2014, be reviewed to determine whether the public footpath was retained in that scheme. Officers confirmed that the previous plans had not included the retention of the footpath. The Committee was therefore bound by that approval decision and could not now mandate that the footpath be retained.

Upon a request from Members for further clarity, officers confirmed that the proposed parking provision was for tandem parking, with two spaces allocated to each dwelling, totalling six spaces. Members were concerned that these spaces could lead to disputes between neighbours. Officers suggested that to allay these concerns, Condition 2 could be amended to ensure that occupants of the site adhere to the parking rules for the lifetime of the development.

Members sought clarity over whether the dropped kerb listed on the plans would remain Council property. Officers confirmed that this was in private ownership, but that the Heads of Terms regarding the stopping up order for highways work could be amended to ensure that the kerb area was to be maintained as an open and level area, and therefore still useable.

Similarly, it was suggested that a Construction Management condition be added to ensure that the area in front of the units' front gardens be kept clear and open, to enable vehicle manoeuvring.

On this basis, the Committee moved the officer's recommendation. This was seconded and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

**RESOLVED:**

- 1. That the application be approved, subject to:**
  - a. the addition of a Construction Management condition; and**
  - b. The addition of a parking allocation condition;**
  
- 2. That delegated authority be given to the Head of Planning and Enforcement to amend the Heads of Terms to establish a clear area in front of the three new dwellings, that is to be used as a general vehicle turning area.**

97. **KINGS ARMS COURT - 10954/APP/2017/2353** (*Agenda Item 8*)

**Change of use of part of the ground floor retail unit (Class A1) to a hot food takeaway (Class A5) and associated external alterations, including the installation of ventilation and extraction equipment and associated works**

Officers introduced the report, and provided an overview of the application. The Committee was informed that the proposed change would only be applied to part of the retail space, and therefore would not have a material effect on the overall viability of the

retail space within the building or wider town centre.

Mitigation measures and planning conditions were recommended to ensure that the proposed use did not detract from the amenities of the occupants of the building and neighbouring sites.

The applicant had requested that Condition 6 be amended to clarify that deliveries and collections from the site were not prohibited. It was recommended that delegated authority be given to the Head of Planning and Enforcement to make this requested change, and ensure that the condition clearly referenced hours of use only.

On the basis of the above, the officer's recommendation was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

**RESOLVED:**

- 1. That the application be approved; and**
- 2. That delegated authority be given to the Head of Planning and Enforcement to amend the wording of condition 6.**

98. **BRUNEL UNIVERSITY- 532/APP/2017/2319** (*Agenda Item 9*)

**Relocation of ancillary waste and chemical stores (Retrospective)**

Officers introduced the report, and confirmed that the application was seeking retrospective planning permission for works already completed. It was confirmed that the relocated refuse and chemical stores were less visible than previously, and had no impact on accommodation or the Green Belt. It was therefore recommended that permission be granted.

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

**RESOLVED: That the application be approved.**

99. **TAMARA LOUNGE, BRYON PARADE - 61362/APP/2017/1902** (*Agenda Item 10*)

**Retention of a replacement single storey side/rear canopy extension and single storey store building to existing part Drinks Establishment (Use Class A4) and part Shisha Lounge (Sui Generis) following demolition of existing side/rear canopy extension incorporating a store and servery**

Officers introduced the report, and provided an overview of the application. It was confirmed that the proposed development was significantly removed from the closest residential properties, and had no impact on residential amenity. The canopy itself would be located at the rear of the site, and therefore not visible from the street. The application was therefore recommended for approval.

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

**RESOLVED: That the application be approved.**

100.	<p><b>1 DE SALIS ROAD - 59992/APP/2016/775</b> (<i>Agenda Item 11</i>)</p> <p><b>Conversion of 3-bed dwelling house into 2 x 2-bed self contained flats with associated amenity space and cycle stores involving part two storey, part single storey side extension and part two storey, part single storey rear extension</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the report, and provided an overview of the application. The Committee was informed that, while the size of the proposed units met the Council and London Plan standards, the proposal failed to provide the minimum parking provision required, and for this reason it was recommended that the application be refused.</p> <p>On the basis that the application did not provide adequate parking provision, the officer's recommendation was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED: That the application be refused.</b></p>
101.	<p><b>9 RYEFIELD AVENUE - 5457/APP/2017/1667</b> (<i>Agenda Item 12</i>)</p> <p><b>Two storey, 3-bed dwelling with associated parking and amenity space</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the report, and provided an overview of the application. The Committee was informed that application sought the erection of a 3 bedroom house attached to an existing dwelling, filling in the side of the building, forward of the building line. Such issues were addressed within the Council's Supplementary Planning Document on residential layouts which stated that such issues should be avoided. In addition, it was deemed that the proposal was out of keeping with the character of the surrounding area and detrimental to the visual amenity of the street scene due to the layout, scale, and siting of the proposed development.</p> <p>It was highlighted that the report summary had omitted additional reasons for refusal, including the size of the bedrooms (which were below minimum size standards) and concerns over parking. For the above reasons, the application was recommended for refusal.</p> <p>The Committee shared the officer's concerns, and moved the recommendation. This was seconded, and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED: That the application be refused.</b></p>
102.	<p><b>REAR OF 1-3 COLHAM MILL ROAD - 52884/APP/2016/1978</b> (<i>Agenda Item 13</i>)</p> <p><b>2-bed detached bungalow with associated parking and amenity space</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the report, and provided an overview of the application. The Committee was informed that the proposal was visually at odds with the character of the area, and would result in a cramped development, with windows close to boundary lines which would result in a loss of residential amenity. In addition, the application proposed the retention of two garages, but due to the constrained nature of the development, these would be unusable. Condition 4 of the report was highlighted, and it was suggested that the reference to 'closing an important gap in the area' should be removed, as this was not the case. On this basis, it was recommended that the application be refused.</p> <p>The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote,</p>

unanimously agreed.

**RESOLVED: That the application be refused.**

103. **CITY FLOWER TRADERS, PACKET BOAT MARINA, PACKET BOAT LANE - 53216/APP/2017/1744** (*Agenda Item 14*)

**Change of use from Use Class B1 (Business) to Class D2 (Assembly and Leisure)**

Officers introduced the report, and provided an overview of the application. Officers asserted that the proposed use of the site was welcome, and the small floorspace would not result in a material impact to the surrounding area. The addendum was highlighted, and it was recommended that Condition 5 be amended to ensure that the amenity of occupiers of nearby boats was not adversely affected. The application was recommended for approval.

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

**RESOLVED:**

- 1. That the application be approved; and**
- 2. That Condition 5 be amended as set out in the planning addendum.**

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 Neil Fraser on 018950250692. 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.**