

## Minutes



**CENTRAL & South Planning Committee**

**20 March 2018**

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

	<p><b>Committee Members Present:</b> Councillors Ian Edwards (Chairman), David Yarrow (Vice-Chairman), Shehryar Ahmad-Wallana, Roy Chamdal, Alan Chapman, Brian Stead, Peter Money and John Morse</p> <p><b>LBH Officers Present:</b> James Roger (Head of Planning and Enforcement), Meghji Hirani (Planning Contracts &amp; Planning Information), Glen Egan (Office Managing Partner - Legal Services), Alan Tilly (Transport and Aviation Manager) and Neil Fraser (Democratic Services Officer)</p>
199.	<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
200.	<p><b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING</b> (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>Councillor Peter Money declared a pecuniary interest in respect of item 9. Councillor Money confirmed that he would leave the room when the item was due for determination.</p> <p>Councillor Peter Money declared a non-pecuniary interest in item 15, and stated that he would remain in the room when the item was due for determination, but would take no part in its determination.</p>
201.	<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 1 March 2018 be approved as a correct record.</p>
202.	<p><b>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
203.	<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 the items of business marked as Part I would be considered in Public and that the items marked as Part II would be considered in private.</p>

**Conversion of dwelling into 3 x 1-bed self-contained flats involving part two storey, part single storey rear extension, single storey front extension and extension to existing vehicular crossover to front with associated parking and communal garden.**

Officers introduced the report and highlighted the planning history at the site. The Committee was reminded that the only external change from the previously permitted conversion scheme was the addition of part two-story rear extension. Officers advised that the proposed scheme would provide an appropriate level of accommodation which satisfied all relevant standards and, subject to appropriate conditions, would not result in adverse amenity issues for neighbours. Car parking complied with the relevant standards, and while the development introduced a crown roof, this was also a feature of the extant permission and, on balance, it was considered that this would not be harmful to the character of the dwelling or the wider area. On this basis, the officers recommended that planning permission be granted.

Officers suggested that the Committee may wish to add the Council's standard allocated parking condition to ensure that the three proposed parking spaces were allocated in an even manner (i.e. one space per flat), and requested that the Head of Planning and Enforcement be granted delegated authority to make changes to condition 7, to ensure that at least 25% of the front garden was soft landscaping.

The addendum was highlighted, in which it was confirmed that a petition in support of the application, totalling 26 signatures, had been received.

A petition in objection to the application had been received, but the petitioner was not present to address the Committee.

The applicant and agent addressed the Committee, the key points of which included:

- As stated by officers, approval for the majority of the proposal had already been granted.
- As the proposed drop curb was located in a small cul-de-sac it was felt that this would not cause major problems in the area. In addition, the dropped kerb added an element of landscaping to the front garden where currently there was none, and therefore improved the outlook.
- In response to the points raised by the objectors in that the development was out of keeping with the area because it would result in flats, the Committee was reminded that flats had already been approved at the site. The current application was to change the number of flats, from a two-bed and one one-bed, to three one-bedroom flats. The number of bedrooms was to remain the same.
- Objectors had asserted that the proposal would result in a loss of a house. The Committee was reminded that planning permission for the conversion to flats had already been granted.
- Regarding highway safety issues, three parking spaces had already been approved and set in the front of the property, so this did not amount to a material change. The proposal met the Council's policies relating to sufficient parking.
- Regarding potential loss of sunlight to adjoining buildings, there was a large garage to the side, where the current extension was, and so the proposal would have no impact on the adjoining house or garden.
- Regarding the potential for increased noise, refuse, and intensity of development, it was highlighted that the existing house had four bedrooms

which could house up to eight people. The new proposals for three bedrooms meant that, in theory, there could only be a maximum of six occupants, and so noise and refuse should be reduced. Density was as per the London Plan.

- The application had been considered by the Council for several months, and it was requested that it be approved.

The Committee acknowledged that the majority of the application had been previously approved. Having considered the points raised within the petition in objection and the reply to those points by the agent and applicant, Members confirmed that they could see no reason to overturn the officer's recommendation. The officer's recommendation, including the addition and amendment of conditions as outlined previously, was therefore moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That the application be approved;
2. That the Council's standard allocated parking condition be added to ensure parking spaces were allocated evenly; and
3. That delegated authority be granted to the Head of Planning and Enforcement to amend condition 7, to ensure that at least 25% of the front garden was soft landscaping.

205. **STOCKLEY PARK EAST MAIN ENTRANCE - 69635/ADV/2017/133** (*Agenda Item 7*)

**Installation of freestanding sign**

Officers introduced the report.

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

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

206. **14 MOORFIELD ROAD, COWLEY - 69313/APP/2017/4614** (*Agenda Item 8*)

**First floor rear extension**

Officers introduced the report, and highlighted the application history, including the successful appeal that had granted permission for the conversion of the property into two separate units, and a second successful appeal for a first floor rear extension. The current application was seeking an extension to the rear first floor, across the entire width of the property, to provide a third bedroom and study. This extension would have no impact on adjoining properties and no impact on the flood zone, and complied with Council standards and policies, and on this basis the application was recommended for approval.

Members confirmed that although reservations remained regarding whether the developed property was in keeping with the surrounding street scene, there were no justifiable reasons to refuse the application. The officer's recommendation was therefore moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

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

207. **29 MANOR LANE - 15434/APP/2017/2673** (*Agenda Item 9*)

**Conversion of roofspace to habitable use to include a front dormer.**

Officers introduced the report, and confirmed that current guidance stated that front dormers were acceptable on bungalows. It was highlighted that the property adjoined a conservation area, but was not located within that conservation area. The application was recommended for approval.

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

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

208. **74 LONG LANE - 16806/APP/2017/4000** (*Agenda Item 10*)

**Part two storey, part single storey rear extension, porch to front and conversion of roofspace to habitable use to include a rear dormer, 1 side rooflight and 3 front rooflights**

Officers introduced the report, and confirmed that the proposed single story rear extension was in excess of normal policy, but as the adjoining property also had a rear extension of the same depth, would have no detrimental impact on adjoining occupants. The two story rear element was confirmed to comply fully with the policy regarding 45 degree line of sight from adjoining properties, and the design and rear dormer also complied with policy. The application was not deemed to have a detrimental impact on adjoining occupiers.

The addendum was highlighted, which included a suggested additional condition to prohibit the property from being sub-divided to form additional dwelling units or be used in multiple occupation without a further express permission from the Local Planning Authority. Conditional approval was recommended.

Members felt that the property was of sufficient size to accommodate the proposed changes, and recognised the importance of the additional condition as set out in the addendum. The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

**RESOLVED: That the application be approved, subject to the addition of a condition to prohibit the property from being sub-divided to form additional dwelling units or be used in multiple occupation without a further express permission from the Local Planning Authority.**

209. **17 MANOR ROAD - 30753/APP/2017/3611** (*Agenda Item 11*)

**2 storage sheds at rear of garden**

Officers introduced the report, and confirmed that the application was seeking permission for two separate outbuildings that would total over 50 square meters of floor space. This was considered unacceptable due to concerns over size and scale, and the application was recommended for refusal.

Members shared the opinion of officers that the proposed buildings were too large, and the officer's recommendation was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, unanimously approved.

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

210. **LAND FORMING PART OF 28, & 28 WEST WALK HAYES - 71945/APP/2017/3032**  
(Agenda Item 12)

**Two storey, 2-bed, attached dwelling with associated parking and amenity space and part two storey, part single storey rear extension to existing dwelling and installation of crossover to front**

Officers introduced the report, and confirmed that the application had been deferred from the Planning Committee held on 7 February 2018 to allow Members to visit the site. That site visit had since taken place, and Members were reminded that a full presentation on the application had been provided to the Committee prior to that visit.

Officers asserted that the application failed to address relevant national and Council policies alongside the HDAS (SPG), and it was considered that the proposal would result in a cramped development due to its siting on an open, prominent, position, and would be visually at odds with the predominant character, appearance and scale of buildings within the surrounding street scene. The proposal also failed to make sufficient parking provision to meet Council standards.

Clarity was sought on the non-standard reason for refusal that related to parking spaces. Officers advised the Committee that for two-bed family dwelling properties, one and a half parking spaces per dwelling was sought. On this particular site, there would therefore be a requirement for three parking spaces. The Committee was advised that it was unlikely that such a refusal reason could be successfully defended, should the matter go to an appeal.

The Chairman clarified that, upon attending the site visit, it was apparent that most properties within the area had one parking space, and it was accepted that it was difficult to allocate one and a half spaces per property on such a small development. On this basis, it was felt that it would be difficult to argue that the proposal was not providing adequate parking provision.

The Chairman highlighted the officer's report, which set out the strong reasons why officers felt that the proposal would have a detrimental impact on the street scene, in what was an area of special local character. The Chairman requested that the Committee consider whether the benefit of an additional property being built in the area outweighed the detrimental impact of the development on the street scene.

Member opinions were mixed. Some Members felt that the impact on the street scene was negligible. It was pointed out that, within the area of special local character, all terraced houses were situated on the north side of the street, with semi-detached properties on the south side. Upon review, three of the terraced houses (namely 33 East Walk, 22 West Walk, and 25 West Walk) were felt to have a significant detrimental impact on the street scene in excess of that which would be caused by the proposed development. It was suggested that some of these properties had been developed in contravention to local planning policies, for example by including hipped roofs.

It was also felt that the lack of uniformity within the properties in the area meant that there was no real street scene to impact upon. In addition, when looking into the street, the first thing seen was a large shed that was more prominently sited than the proposed development, which would only advance forward a small distance. It was therefore suggested that the proposed development would be appropriate to the location, and therefore the application should be permitted.

In response, officers confirmed that some of the properties within the terrace had been developed lawfully in compliance with Council policy at the time, (with one example given of a permitted development from 2008), though it was accepted that policies had since been changed. Other properties were either lacking in planning history or under review and potential enforcement action.

Officers confirmed that the reasons for refusal relating to the impact on the street scene could be sustained at an appeal, as the character of the street was being significantly changed by introducing an additional dwelling, and while other properties in the area had been extended, they had not been split into separate houses. It was suggested that, by allowing this application, a precedent would be set that would allow further plots to be subdivided, which would have a marked impact on the area of special local character moving forward.

Officers drew the Committee's attention to the comments of the conservation officer and the Conservation Area Advisory Panel. Concerns raised were predominantly around the infilling of the space around the buildings and visual the impact of that, as well as the visual impact of the side wall, rather than the design of the property.

A contrasting view was raised, and the officers report was highlighted, which stated that the Council had implemented the requirement within the National Planning Policy Framework to work with the applicant in a positive and proactive way, but that they had been unable to seek solutions to problems arising from the application as the principle of the proposal was clearly contrary to the Council's statutory policies, and negotiation could not overcome the reasons for refusal.

Some Members took the view that there was no justifiable reason to overturn the officer's decision, following the robust reasons for refusal set out in the report, as well as the detrimental impact on the street scene that had been observed during the site visit. The officer's suggestion that by allowing the application, Member's would be setting a precedent for other plots in the area to be subdivided was noted.

The officer's recommendation was moved and seconded. When put to a vote, the recommendation was agreed by a vote of 5 to 2.

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

211. **ENFORCEMENT REPORT** (*Agenda Item 13*)

**RESOLVED:**

**1. That the enforcement action as recommended in the officer's report was agreed unanimously.**

**2. That the Committee resolved to release their decision and the reasons for it outlined in the report into the public domain, solely 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).*

212.	<p><b>ENFORCEMENT REPORT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 14</i>)</p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b></p> <p><b>1. That the enforcement action as recommended in the officer's report was agreed unanimously.</b></p> <p><b>2. That the Committee resolved to release their decision and the reasons for it outlined in the report into the public domain, solely for the purposes of issuing the formal breach of condition notice to the individual concerned.</b></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>
213.	<p><b>ENFORCEMENT REPORT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 15</i>)</p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b></p> <p><b>1. That the enforcement action as recommended in the officer's report was agreed unanimously.</b></p> <p><b>2. That the Committee resolved to release their decision and the reasons for it outlined in the report into the public domain, solely for the purposes of issuing the formal breach of condition notice to the individual concerned.</b></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>
214.	<p><b>ENFORCEMENT REPORT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 16</i>)</p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b></p> <p><b>1. That the enforcement action as recommended in the officer's report was agreed unanimously.</b></p> <p><b>2. That the Committee resolved to release their decision and the reasons for it outlined in the report into the public domain, solely for the purposes of issuing the formal breach of condition notice to the individual concerned.</b></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</i></p>

	<i>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>
	The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 7.52 pm.

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Neil Fraser on 01895 250692. 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.**