

Minutes



CENTRAL & South Planning Committee

2 October 2019

Meeting held at Civic Centre, High Street, Uxbridge, Middlesex UB8 1UW

	<p>Committee Members Present: Councillors Ian Edwards (Chairman), Roy Chamdal (Vice-Chairman), Shehryar Ahmad-Wallana, Mohinder Birah, Nicola Brightman, Janet Duncan (Labour Lead), Duncan Flynn (Reserve) (In place of Steve Tuckwell), Simon Arnold (In place of Alan Chapman) and John Oswell (In place of Jazz Dhillon)</p> <p>Also Present: Councillors Martin Goddard and Richard Mills.</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: Meghji Hirani (Planning Contracts & Planning Information), Armid Akram (Highways Development Control Officer) and Nicole Cameron (Legal Advisor)</p>
54.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies were received from Councillors Chapman, Dhillon and Tuckwell. Councillors Arnold, Oswell and Flynn were present as their substitutes, respectively.</p>
55.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
56.	<p>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 3 September 2019 be approved as a correct record.</p>
57.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
58.	<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 items 1-14 were Part I, and would be considered in public, and that items 15-17 were Part II, and would be considered in private.</p>
59.	<p>27A CHURCH ROAD, COWLEY - 74287/APP/2019/2378 (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p>

Erection of two storey building with habitable roof space to create 4 x 1-bed and 2 x 2-bed self-contained flats, with associated refuse and cycle storage and parking, involving demolition of existing bungalow

Officers introduced the report and highlighted the addendum, which confirmed that revised plans had been received which set out the erection of privacy screens on the rear balconies and the provision of roof lights with an outlook to habitable rooms within the roof space. The revised plans were considered to address the concerns raised in respect of overlooking, loss of privacy and a lack of light, so it was recommended that refusal reasons 3 and 6 be removed. In addition, it was felt that refusal reason 2 could not be defended, so was also recommended to be removed.

The application itself was considered unacceptable in principle as it failed to harmonise with its surroundings and would result in an unacceptable impact on the Conservation Area and adjacent listed buildings. The proposal was also considered unacceptable in highways safety terms, and would provide inadequate on-site parking, an unneighbourly form of development, and a poor standard of residential amenity to future occupiers. For these reasons, it was recommended that the application be refused.

A petitioner addressed the Committee in objection to the application. Key points raised included:

- The petitioner agreed with all the non-standard reasons for refusal given in the posted Planning Officers report.
- The side facing windows at ground floor level at 25 Church Road were not secondary windows.
- There were several misrepresentations and inaccuracies contained within the developer's planning statement, and concerns remained over the heritage document commissioned in support of that planning statement.
- Issues with the proposal included its failure to harmonise with the character of the existing area, the lack of on-site parking, the scale and size of the building, and its impact on health, quality of life and human rights of nearby residents.
- Ancient Rights would be impacted as two of the petitioner's lounge windows would be blocked by the proposed side brick wall. These were primary windows, which provided in excess of 30% of the total light.
- The entrance to the site was hazardous, as motorists would be required to turn into oncoming traffic.
- Land Registry documents for 27A Church Road showed restrictive covenants that stated that no houses were to be erected, save for detached houses. The proposal was not for a detached house.

Councillor Richard Mills addressed the Committee as Ward Councillor for Brunel. Key points raised included:

- The proposal constituted overdevelopment that was not in keeping with the character of the area or prevailing street scene.
- The proposal would have a negative impact on the Conservation Area and nearby listed buildings.
- Parking provision was insufficient.
- The increase in vehicle movements would have an adverse impact on pedestrian safety, including users of the nearby bus stop.
- The proposal was not aesthetically pleasing and was not congruent with the size and bulk of other nearby buildings.

- The proposal would result in a poor standard of living for future occupiers.

In response to the petitioner, the Legal representative confirmed that both Ancient Rights and Restricted Covenants were not matters for the Committee to consider.

In response to a Member query, officers confirmed that the proposed privacy screens were 1.8m in height, which was a standard screening height.

Members agreed with the refusal reasons set out in the report, and moved the officer's recommendation. This was seconded, and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED: That the application be refused.

60. **FOOTPATH AT JUNCTION OF KEITH ROAD AND STATION ROAD - 74938/APP/2019/2246** (*Agenda Item 7*)

Removal of an existing 11.7m telecommunication mast and associated equipment and installation and relocation of a replacement 20m monopole with wraparound cabinet at base and 7 new associated cabinets

Officers introduced the report and highlighted the addendum which included the proposed sizes of the new cabinets. Officers remained concerned over the size and height of the mast, and the size and number of the cabinets in such a prominent, easily visible location. It was therefore considered that the proposal would have an adverse impact on the street scene. For these reasons, the application was recommended for refusal, subject to delegated authority being granted to the Head of Planning to strengthen the wording of the refusal reason, including reference to the level of investment currently being put into the area for regeneration.

Members agreed that while development of a 5g network was to be supported, the proposal was unacceptable due to its location, size and visibility. For these reasons the recommendation was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED:

1. That the application be refused; and
2. That delegated authority be granted to the Head of Planning to strengthen the wording of the refusal reason.

61. **NAVNAT CENTRE, PRINTING HOUSE LANE - 4210/APP/2019/2370** (*Agenda Item 8*)

Proposed extension to main building to create new dining hall and associated works to create a garden terrace

Officers introduced the report, highlighting that ,while the application was within the Green Belt, the proposed increase in size constituted less than 50% of the existing building and was therefore considered acceptable. The proposal's impact on the Green Belt and nearby residents was considered to be minor, and the application was therefore recommended for approval, subject to the Committee granting delegated authority to the Head of Planning to add a further condition regarding noise and times of use.

Members sought clarity on whether the Special Circumstances test for development within the Green Belt was required to be applied in this case. Officers confirmed that

the test was not required in this instance. Officers went on to confirm that, if approved, any further applications on the site would review potential size increases against the building's original size, not its extended size.

Some Members felt that the proposed increase in the size of the building was unacceptable, and that the use of the site as a community centre that would be holding events would result in noise and disturbances.

Other Members felt that the application was acceptable, and moved the officer's recommendation. This was seconded, and when put a vote, agreed by a vote of 6 to 2.

RESOLVED:

- 1. That the application be approved; and**
- 2. That delegated authority be granted to the Head of Planning to add a condition restricting noise and times of use.**

62. **7 ROUNDWOOD AVENUE, STOCKLEY PARK - 37203/APP/2019/1699** (*Agenda Item 9*)

Alterations including a vehicle access road, replacement plant, installation of bike storage, new pedestrian pathway, external lighting, landscaping, new entrance door and associated works

Officers introduced the report and highlighted the addendum, which set out the proposed removal of refusal reason 5 and the addition of plans and a Method Statement to condition 2. Officers confirmed that while the application was sited within the Green Belt, the proposal was for a minor alteration and 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.

63. **GOALS SOCCER CENTRE, SPRINGFIELD ROAD - 49962/ADV/2019/38** (*Agenda Item 10*)

Installation of internally illuminated fascia sign

Officers introduced the report, confirming that while the site was located within the Green Belt, the installation of a new sign would have minimal impact on the area or nearby occupiers, and 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.

64. **ASC INTERNATIONAL SCHOOL - 64228/APP/2019/1915** (*Agenda Item 11*)

Installation of an emergency external generator

Officers introduced the report, and highlighted that while the site was located within the Green Belt, the generator was considered to have no impact on residential properties

or the area. The generator was to be sunk and not visible, and conditions relating to noise were proposed. The application was therefore recommended for approval, subject to the Head of Planning being given delegated authority to amend conditions relating to the use of the generator to ensure they were not overly restrictive.

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 granted to the Head of Planning to reword conditions relating to the use of the generator.**

65. **692 UXBRIDGE ROAD - 33394/APP/2019/2306** (*Agenda Item 12*)

Change of use from retail (Use Class A1) to a mixed use comprising restaurant and hot food takeaway (Use Classes A3 and A5) with installation of flue to rear

Officers introduced the report and highlighted the addendum, which included the results of a recent survey of the shopping centre. The current retail percentage in the primary frontage was 57.4%, an increase on the 2016 survey, but some way short of the Council's required minimum of 70% retail use. Officers highlighted that there was already a vacant unit with permitted take away use at the centre, which could be taken up, which would avoid the loss of a retail unit. The application was therefore recommended for refusal.

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

RESOLVED: That the application be refused.

66. **3 CAMBRIDGE ROAD, UXBRIDGE - 74413/APP/2018/4343** (*Agenda Item 13*)

Erection of three storey building to create 6 x 2-bed self contained flats, with associated parking and amenity space, involving demolition of existing dwelling

Officers introduced the report, and highlighted that the application had been deferred from a previous Committee meeting to enable the Committee to source additional information on the proposal's impact on 1 Cambridge Road. A site visit had been conducted, and additional information had been sourced and set out in the report, which had resulted in the addition of further reasons for refusal relating to the proposal's impact on adjoining occupiers and the size of bedrooms. The recommendation remained that the application be refused.

Councillor Goddard addressed the Committee as Ward Councillor for Uxbridge North. Key points raised included:

- There was significant history to the application, and numerous revisions to plans had been submitted, which had caused concern and frustration for residents.
- The application was overdevelopment and should be refused for the reasons as set out in the report.

Members agreed with the refusal reasons as set out in the report, and moved the

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

RESOLVED: That the application be refused.

67. **LAND AT JUNCTION ADJACENT WITH FALLING LANE AND ROYAL LANE - 70600/APP/2019/1469** (*Agenda Item 14*)

Replacement of existing 12.5m high monopole with a new 17.5m high monopole supporting 6 antennas and installation of 2 additional equipment cabinets and development ancillary thereto

Officers introduced the report and addendum, which confirmed that the item description on the agenda's content page was incorrect.

The report detailed the applicant's amended proposal, which included a reduction in the number of cabinets. This reduced number, together with the screening of the pole, would result in a negligible impact on the street scene, and the application was therefore recommended for approval.

Members agreed that the application was acceptable, but requested that officers and future applicants consider more weatherproof colours and paints for cabinets, to ensure that they could better withstand the elements over the long term.

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

RESOLVED: That the application be approved.

68. **ENFORCEMENT REPORT** (*Agenda Item 15*)

RESOLVED:

- 1. That the enforcement action, as recommended in the officer's report, was agreed; and,**
- 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 it 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 1, 2 and 7 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 as amended).

69. **ENFORCEMENT REPORT** (*Agenda Item 16*)

The item was withdrawn.

70. **ENFORCEMENT REPORT** (*Agenda Item 17*)

RESOLVED:

- 1. That the enforcement action, as recommended in the officer's report, was agreed; and,**
- 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 it 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 1, 2 and 7 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 as amended).

The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 8.11 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.