

Minutes



CENTRAL & South Planning Committee

6 November 2019

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

	<p>Committee Members Present: Councillors Ian Edwards (Chairman), Roy Chamdal (Vice-Chairman), Shehryar Ahmad-Wallana, Mohinder Birah, Nicola Brightman, Alan Chapman, Jazz Dhillon, Janet Duncan (Labour Lead) and Steve Tuckwell</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: Liz Penny (Democratic Services Officer), Noel Kelly, Meghji Hirani (Planning Contracts & Planning Information), Kerrie Munro and Alan Tilly (Transport, Planning and Development Manager)</p>
71.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>There were no apologies for absence.</p>
72.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>Councillor Jazz Dhillon declared a non-pecuniary interest in agenda item 14 as he had prior knowledge of the site. He did not vote on this item but remained in the room during the discussion.</p>
73.	<p>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING DATED 2 OCTOBER 2019 (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>RESOLVED That: the minutes of the meeting dated 2 October 2019 be approved subject to the addition of the wording 'The Petitioner stated that they agreed with all the non-standard reasons given in the posted Planning Officer's report' in relation to item 6 – 27a Church Road, Cowley.</p>
74.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
75.	<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 (agenda items 1-13) would be considered in public and the item of business marked Part II (agenda item 14) would be considered in private.</p>

Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of three storey building to provide 6 x 3-bed flats with associated car and cycle parking, amenity space and refuse storage and installation of vehicular crossover to front.

Officers presented the report and highlighted the addendum. Members were advised that the proposal was considered to be unacceptable as it would result in an overdevelopment of Fairfield Road. It was recommended that the application be refused as it would give rise to an unacceptable level of flatted developments in close proximity to each other which was contrary to policies in the Hillingdon Local Plan. Moreover, due to its siting in an open prominent position, the proposed development would result in the loss of an important gap characteristic to the area. It was considered that the design of the proposed development by reason of its size, scale and bulk would be detrimental to the character of the street scene and surrounding area. Furthermore, there were concerns in relation to the elevated site, the impact on 45 Fairfield Road, the lack of parking provision and the absence of a lift in the proposed development. Members were informed that the application was the subject of a non-determination appeal; the recommendation had been amended slightly to reflect this (as highlighted in the addendum).

A petitioner spoke in objection to the proposed development highlighting local residents' concerns. Members were informed that it was a very nice family area with a variety of properties. It was acknowledged that the current flats were not unsympathetic to the character of the area; however, the area was already very busy and congested – particularly at the junction of Fairfield Road and Harefield Road which was a blind corner. It was felt that the proposed development would add to the risk to public safety. Moreover, it would be unsightly particularly in view of its elevated position, would impact negatively on residents in nearby houses and was not in keeping with the character of the current properties in the area.

Councillor Raymond Graham addressed the Committee as Ward Councillor for Uxbridge North. Councillor Graham commented that the proposed new development would not harmonise with the street scene and would be incongruous. Moreover, it would increase the number of flats in the area to an unacceptable level – exceeding the permitted figure of 10%. The Highways officer's comment regarding the foreseen increase in traffic was also of concern. Furthermore, the development would have an overbearing effect on number 45 and on the facing properties on Harefield Road.

Members requested further clarification regarding the risk to public safety and the impact on outlook to the properties on Harefield Road. In relation to the public safety query, Members were informed that the proposed development would result in additional traffic and parking stress which were matters of some concern to the Highways Department. It was confirmed that the junction of Harefield Road and Fairfield Road was currently protected by double yellow lines. The Committee was advised that highway capacity and road safety were not deemed to be grounds for refusal in this case. With regards to the impact on outlook to properties on Harefield Road, the Committee was informed that there would be a significant impact; particularly given the site elevation.

Councillors expressed concern regarding the proximity of the proposed development to the road. It was noted that, if approved, the proposal would move the building line to within one metre of the road; this was unprecedented. Councillors commented that this would be very damaging to the street scene and could set a precedent for future developments. Given these concerns, Members requested that officers strengthen

refusal reason two accordingly. It was agreed that authority be delegated to the Head of Planning and Enforcement to strengthen refusal reason two as requested by the Committee.

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

RESOLVED:

- 1. That the application be refused subject to the strengthening of refusal reason two; and**
- 2. That delegated authority be granted to the Head of Planning and Enforcement to strengthen refusal reason two to protect the current building line.**

77. **4 HAMILTON ROAD, UXBRIDGE - 28273/APP/2019/2221** (*Agenda Item 7*)

Single storey side / rear extension (retrospective)

Officers presented the report and highlighted the addendum. Members were informed that the application sought retrospective planning permission for a single storey side / rear extension which differed extensively from the development approved in 2018 under ref: 28273/APP/2018/2037. It was noted that the development had failed to meet the conditions and design of the approved plans and could not be supported by the Council. The Committee was advised that the development lay within the Clayton Way Area of Special Local Character (ASLC); it was not in keeping with the area due to its projecting design, poor use of materials and tinted brickwork finish which did not match the main dwelling. Furthermore, Members were advised that the garage in the garden had been retained and lay in close proximity to the extension thereby increasing the apparent overall size and scale of the development.

A petitioner spoke in objection to the application noting that the development had not been constructed in accordance with the submitted plans. The petitioner advised Members that the development had had a significant negative impact on neighbours and expressed concern regarding the lack of adherence to basic building practices. Issues raised included the impact on the ASLC, damage to properties during the build, the incongruous tinted brickwork finish and health and safety concerns.

Members expressed further concern regarding the variation in the brick bond at the site which was jarring to the eye. It was agreed that the reasons for refusal be amended slightly to include a reference to 'un-matching construction' or 'design detail' and authority be delegated to the Head of Planning and Enforcement to word this minor addition to the refusal reasons.

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

RESOLVED:

- 1) That the application be refused subject to a minor amendment to the reasons for refusal in relation to 'design detail'; and**
- 2) That delegated authority be granted to the Head of Planning and Enforcement to word this minor amendment to the reasons for refusal.**

78. **RIDING STABLES, GOULDS GREEN - 26738/APP/2019/2207** (*Agenda Item 8*)

Demolition of stables and erection of cattery pens (Use Class Sui Generis) and rebuilding of the office / store (part retrospective)

Officers presented the report and highlighted the information in the addendum and the appeal decision. Members were advised that a previous application of a similar nature had been refused and dismissed at appeal. It was noted that the current application differed in size with a reduction of almost 50%. The site was considered suitable in terms of its distance from adjacent properties thereby minimising the impact on residents. It was also noted that the site was suitably enclosed.

Councillors were advised that, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, no development was allowed on Green Belt land unless very special circumstances existed. It was noted that the Inspector had previously found that 'very special circumstances' did not exist in this case. It was unclear whether the business use of the site as a cattery was part of the reason for refusal. Members commented that the proposed cattery would increase openness at the site which was considered to be beneficial. Due to the lack of certainty in a number of key areas, it was agreed that the application be deferred for further consideration at a future meeting of the Planning Committee. This course of action would enable officers to clarify what additional information could be considered that was not previously put before the Inspector. The use class could also be clarified.

The option to defer this item was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED That: the application be deferred to be considered at a future planning meeting.

79. **BETWEEN SIPSON ROAD AND HARMONDSWORTH ROAD - 4634/APP/2019/2717** (*Agenda Item 9*)

Installation of a 20m monopole, 12 antenna apertures, 8 equipment cabinets and 10 concrete bollards and the retention of 2 equipment cabinets following the removal of the existing 14.7m monopole, 3 antennas and redundant equipment cabinets.

Officers presented the report and highlighted the information in the addendum. It was acknowledged that the provision of high quality telecommunications infrastructure was supported in principle; however, concerns were raised regarding the increase in height and bulk of the equipment which would result in visual clutter to the detriment of the character and appearance of the West Drayton Green Conservation Area.

Members commented that 5G was to be welcomed but there had to be a balance and it was important that monopoles were sited in appropriate places. It was agreed that the words 'in this prominent public location' be added to the amended reason for refusal as set out in the addendum.

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

RESOLVED:

- 1. That the application be refused subject to the removal of the proposed**

monopole from the reasons for refusal and addition of the wording 'in this prominent public location' to the reasons for refusal; and
2. That delegated authority be granted to the Head of Planning and Enforcement to word this minor amendment to the refusal reasons.

80. **28 OAKDENE ROAD - 74847/APP/2019/1722** (*Agenda Item 10*)

Conversion of two storey dwelling into 2 x 1-bed flats with associated parking and amenity space, involving alterations to existing crossover.

Officers introduced the report and highlighted the addendum. Members noted that the flats complied with all Council and national standards and raised no objections.

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

RESOLVED That: the application be approved.

81. **1376 UXBRIDGE ROAD - 68816/APP/2019/2978** (*Agenda Item 11*)

Change of use from retail (Use Class A1) to taxi control office (Sui Generis / Retrospective)

Officers introduced the report which sought retrospective planning permission for a change of use from retail (Use Class A1) to taxi control office (Sui Generis). It was noted that planning permission had previously been refused in 2014 but was then allowed at appeal. Given that the circumstances had not changed since that decision, the application proposal was considered acceptable and was recommended for approval.

Members requested clarification regarding the proposed hours of operation since it was possible that there were now residents living both above and to the side of the site. Councillors also expressed concern regarding the potential impact on parking. It was noted that circumstances had potentially changed since the appeal decision had been made and it was possible that more people would now be affected; this would need to be reviewed.

Members suggested that a condition (or conditions) be added to limit the impact on nearby residents; this could be in relation to operating times and / or parking controls. It was agreed that the wording of said condition(s) would be referred back to the Chairman of the Central and South Planning Committee for approval.

The officer's recommendation, subject to the addition of a condition(s) to limit the impact on residents, was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED That: the application be approved subject to the addition of condition(s) in relation to operating times and / or parking controls to limit the impact on nearby residents (the wording of which to be drafted by the Head of Planning and referred back to the Chairman for his approval).

82. **12 AND 12A BROADWAY PARADE - 5549/APP/2019/1975** (*Agenda Item 12*)

Conversion of single shop to two shops, use of one part as a newsagents (Use Class A1) and one part as beauty treatment (Use Class Sui Generis) and

alterations to shopfront (Retrospective)

Officers presented the application which sought retrospective planning permission for the conversion of a single shop to two separate shops. Members noted that the application was deemed to be acceptable and complied with policy. Councillors commented that such proposals would assist in helping the High Street to survive in the future. No objections were raised.

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

RESOLVED That: the application be approved.

83. **ST MARYS RC PRIMARY SCHOOL, ROCKINGHAM ROAD - 9069/APP/2019/2686**
(Agenda Item 13)

Siting of a double decker bus on the school playground for use as a library

Officers presented the report and highlighted the information in the addendum. It was noted that the proposal complied with planning policies and was considered to be visually acceptable with no unacceptable impact on residential amenity.

Although it was agreed that the library was a good thing in principle, Members expressed concern regarding accessibility for disabled children who would be unable to access the top floor of the bus. It was agreed that the developers should be encouraged to make all reasonable adjustments to ensure maximum accessibility to all. Councillors also raised concerns regarding the impact on play space at the school but were informed that this matter fell outwith the Planning Committee's remit. It was noted that the bus library would be an additional facility and was not intended to replace the main library in the school building. Members suggested that a condition be added to ensure the existing library was retained as long as the bus was on site.

The officer's recommendation, subject to the addition of a condition in relation to the retention of the existing library, was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously approved.

RESOLVED:

- 1. That the application be approved;**
- 2. That delegated authority be granted to the Head of Planning and Enforcement to word the additional condition in relation to the retention of the existing school library as long as the bus remains on site; and**
- 3. That the developers be encouraged to make reasonable adjustments to maximise accessibility for disabled users – in line with Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010.**

84. **ENFORCEMENT REPORT** *(Agenda Item 14)*

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 8.53 pm.

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Liz Penny on 01895 250185. 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.