

Minutes



CENTRAL & South Planning Committee

30 October 2018

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

	<p>Committee Members Present: Councillors Ian Edwards (Chairman), David Yarrow (Vice-Chairman), Shehryar Ahmad-Wallana, Mohinder Birah, Roy Chamdal, Alan Chapman, Jazz Dhillon, Janet Duncan and Steve Tuckwell (in place of Nicola Brightman)</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: James Rodger (Head of Planning and Enforcement), Meghji Hirani (Planning Contracts & Planning Information), Glen Egan (Office Managing Partner - Legal Services), Armid Akram (Highways Development Control Officer) and Anisha Teji (Democratic Services Officer)</p>
119.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies for absence from Cllr Nicola Brightman, with Cllr Steve Tuckwell substituting.</p>
120.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>Councillor Ahmad – Wallana declared a non-pecuniary interest in agenda item 11 as although he had not been involved with the application, it had been discussed with him. He left the room during the discussion of the item.</p> <p>Councillor Dhillon declared a non-pecuniary interest in agenda item 9 as he had some involvement in the application. He left the room during the discussion of the item.</p>
121.	<p>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>RESOLVED – That the minutes from the meeting on 9 October 2018 be approved as an accurate record.</p>
122.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
123.	<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 agenda items 6 – 10 were Part I and would be considered in public. Agenda items 11 – 13 were Part II and would be considered in private.</p>

124. **98 POLE HILL ROAD, HILLINGDON - 10668/APP/2017/4219** (Agenda Item 6)

Officers introduced the report and provided an overview of the application. Planning permission was sought for the conversion and extension garage to form an annexe. Officers made a recommendation for refusal.

A petitioner spoke in objection of the application and on behalf of the 40 signatures on the petition. The front of the petitioner's house faced the rear garden of 98 Pole Hill Road, and their house was accessed via a private road which was approximately 2.5 m wide. This made access difficult at times. There were three properties in the private road and the houses had been maintained and adopted by the property owners for over twenty years. This included work undertaken in relation to lighting, tarmacking and cutting back vegetation. The petitioner emphasised that the cost of the tarmac alone was in excess of £12,000. The petitioners agreed with the officer's recommendation for refusal. A detached building of 44sqm in the rear garden overlooking other properties would be harmful to the character and appearance of the residential environment. Parking access was not necessary for an elderly resident as there was parking available at the front of the property and a building of this size and magnitude would most likely outlast the relative's needs. The petitioner queried what would happen then and whether this would result in a bed in shed situation.

In response to a Member question, the petitioner confirmed that there had never been access to the existing garage via the private road. No one had a right of access to the private land except the three properties on the private road.

The applicant addressed the Committee. The applicant explained his personal reasons for wanting to extend the existing garage into an annexe. This would be a separate dwelling for the applicant's relatives and this would be safest and most practical option in the applicant's circumstances. In relation to the car parking issue, the applicant explained that in his documentation relating to the house, it was clearly stated that he had access to the garage via the private road. Further the petitioner informed the Committee that he had spoken to the previous owners who had explained that there was a court case in 1976/77 which now granted the access. The applicant understood that there was plenty of available parking at the front of the property, but considered it helpful in the circumstances. He explained however that he was flexible on this point and if the Committee considered it unacceptable he would remove the car parking provision from the application. The applicant submitted that his property was not facing anyone's garden, the height was not going to be more than the other properties nearby, only a single storey was being built and he was only planning to extend the property by no more than 50 % of the existing dwelling.

At the outset, the Chairman queried whether there was no right for the applicant to use the land to gain access to the parking or was the main issue the fact that the angle of the turn was too acute without encroaching onto neighbouring private land. Officers explained that this was not an issue regarding right of access, the applicant had provided documentation about his right of access which could not be disputed. Officers advised members of the public to pursue other avenues if they had any issues with this as this was a private matter. Officers clarified that the main issue was whether the parking spaces could be accessed given that the access road was only 2.5 m and there needed to be a space of 6m to allow access the parking spaces and allow manoeuvring. In this case, it was not possible for the applicant to access the parking spaces without encroaching onto private land.

Members empathised with the applicant, however were mindful that there was an increase in applications of this nature. Policies were in place for a very good reason as

it was very much open to abuse by people who requested it for a reason but then used it for other purposes such as bed in sheds or letting it out. It was accepted that the Council used to allow granny annexes some years ago on the grounds of personal permission for the life of that person, however this did not apply in this case as there were a number of other considerations.

An annex would mean that it was part of the main building, however in this case, the development would be a free standing building. The matter on who had access to the private land was a private issue, but aside that Members were not willing to set a precedent.

Members supported the officer's report, and moved and seconded the officer's recommendation. Upon being put to a vote, the recommendation was unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED: That the application be refused.

125. **NAVNAT CENTRE, PRINTING HOUSE LANE, HAYES - 4210/APP/2018/2821**
(Agenda Item 7)

Officer introduced the report and provided an overview of the application. Planning permission was sought for the development of a play area to the rear of the community centre building on part of the existing field.

Officers also highlighted the information in the addendum. It was noted that there was a correction to the item name and description on the front pages of the agenda.

Members supported the officer's report, and moved and seconded the officer's recommendation. Upon being put to a vote, the recommendation was unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved.

126. **1A POLE HILL ROAD, HILLINGDON - 58843/APP/2018/2843** (Agenda Item 8)

Officers introduced the report and provided an overview of the application. Planning permission was for a single storey rear extension. Officers made a recommendation for approval.

Members supported the officer's report, and moved and seconded the officer's recommendation. Upon being put to a vote, the recommendation was unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved.

127. **60 CARFAX ROAD, HAYES - 51061/APP/2018/2973** (Agenda Item 9)

Officers introduced the report and provided an overview of the application. Planning permission was for a single storey rear extension involving demolition of existing rear extension. Officers made a recommendation for approval.

Members noted that the application complied with policies and that there was a minor discrepancy on page 44 of the agenda pack. This needed to be amended from "encroachment onto No.24's land..." to encroachment to No 62's land.

	<p>Members supported the officer's report, and moved and seconded the officer's recommendation. Upon being put to a vote, the recommendation was unanimously agreed.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the application be approved.</p>
128.	<p>S106 QUARTERLY MONITORING REPORT (<i>Agenda Item 10</i>)</p> <p>Members requested for the reports to be prepared in a easier to follow format. It was confirmed that the S106 monitoring officer for London Borough of Hillingdon would email Members directly in relation to question on refunds.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the s106 quarterly monitoring report be noted.</p>
129.	<p>ENFORCEMENT REPORT (<i>Agenda Item 11</i>)</p> <p>RESOLVED:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the enforcement action as recommended in the officer's report was agreed. 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. <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>
130.	<p>ENFORCEMENT REPORT (<i>Agenda Item 12</i>)</p> <p>RESOLVED:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the enforcement action as recommended in the officer's report was agreed. 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. <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>
131.	<p>ENFORCEMENT REPORT (<i>Agenda Item 13</i>)</p> <p>RESOLVED:</p>

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

The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 7.35 pm.

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Anisha Teji on 01895 277655. 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.