

Minutes



CENTRAL & South Planning Committee

3 December 2020

Meeting held at VIRTUAL - Live on the Council's YouTube channel: Hillingdon London

	<p>Committee Members Present: Councillors Steve Tuckwell (Chairman), Shehryar Ahmad-Wallana, Mohinder Birah, Nicola Brightman, Roy Chamdal, Farhad Choubedar, Jazz Dhillon, Janet Duncan (Opposition Lead) and Becky Haggar</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: Meghji Hirani (Planning Contracts & Planning Information), Kerrie Munro (Legal Advisor), Liz Penny (Democratic Services Officer) and James Rodger (Head of Planning, Transportation and Regeneration)</p>
124.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Alan Chapman with Councillor Becky Haggar substituting.</p>
125.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>Councillor Janet Duncan declared a non-pecuniary interest in item 8 as she lived in the road. She did not participate in the discussion or vote on this item.</p>
126.	<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 dated 5 November 2020 be approved as an accurate record.</p>
127.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
128.	<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 1-13 were in Part I and would be considered in public and items 14-19 were in Part II and would be considered in private.</p>
129.	<p>LAND BEHIND 1 AND 3 LULWORTH WAYE, LULWORTH WAYE, HAYES - 75713/APP/2020/2128 (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p>

Two x 2-bed semi-detached dwellings with associated parking and amenity space involving demolition of existing garage.

Officers introduced the application advising the Committee that the proposal was not deemed to be acceptable as it would not be in keeping with the character of the area and would impact negatively on neighbouring properties – particularly nos. 1 and 3 Lulworth Way. It was noted that there would be insufficient separation between the proposed dwellings and neighbouring properties which would result in overlooking and a loss of privacy.

A petition in support of the application had been received and the agent had submitted written representations which were read out for the consideration of the Committee. Key points raised included:

- The proposed site currently consisted of wasteland therefore the new development would make good use of an unsightly area;
- A petition in support of the application had been received from neighbours;
- The wasteland area was currently being used for criminal / antisocial activities and was frequented by drug users;
- If the application were approved, the applicant would improve the condition of the road, provide adequate lighting and consider installing a security gate to provide a safe and secure environment;
- The proposed development would comply with the London Plan 3.5 Table 3.3 and would meet space standards for new residential developments;
- A new house – 2a Lulworth Way – had recently been constructed opposite 1/3 Lulworth in the rear garden of 37/39 Wimborne Avenue. The proposal was in keeping with said development;
- The proposal did not constitute back-land development or garden-grabbing as the land had not been used as a garden for many years;
- The garden size retained for the existing properties would meet the specification set out in the London Plan and Hillingdon's Local Plan;
- The development would provide much needed housing in the area;
- The existing land was not a positive reflection of local character and was an eyesore at present;
- The disused land had been subjected to anti-social crimes including theft, fly-tipping and drug-related activities – reports had been logged with the Police and the Council on these matters;
- The Council had expressed no concerns in relation to accessibility, parking, highways, refuse and trees.

Members noted that, although parts of the proposal were in line with policy, back-land development of this type was not deemed to be acceptable. Concerns were raised regarding the distance between houses and the detrimental effect the development would have on neighbouring properties. The Committee suggested that the site should be subject to an untidy site notice. Officers agreed to explore this further.

Members suggested that an additional reason for refusal be added in respect of the access road which could potentially be dangerous for drivers and pedestrians. The Committee was informed that, although narrow, the access road was deemed to be adequate as it would serve a very small number of properties. Highways officers considered it to be acceptable and felt it did not constitute a reason for refusal. Members were advised that the length of the access road was particularly relevant – in

this case it did not exceed 45m so the fire services would be able to gain access.

Members raised no further concerns and were in agreement with the officer's recommendation.

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

RESOLVED That:

- 1) the application be refused; and**
- 2) officers explore the possibility of making the site subject to an untidy site notice.**

130. **3 NEWLYN CLOSE, HILLINGDON - 42457/APP/2020/390** (*Agenda Item 7*)

Change of use from single dwelling (Use Class C3) to House in Multiple Occupancy (Use Class C4) with associated parking, involving demolition of existing garage.

Officers introduced the application and highlighted the information in the addendum. Members were reminded that the application had been deferred on 1 July 2020 to obtain further information regarding parking arrangements, vehicular access and the existence of a second HMO in Newlyn Close. Speaking rights had been exercised via written representations at that time. It was noted that a non-determination appeal had been received hence Members would be voting to indicate whether they would choose to approve / refuse the application, had an appeal not been received.

Members were informed that the dwelling could accommodate 3 parking spaces which would comply with Council standards. It was confirmed that manoeuvrability was also adequate. The proposal was to demolish the existing garage to create additional parking space.

With regards to the existence of another HMO in the area, Council tax records suggested that there was a student house in the near vicinity of the application site; presumably at no.9 Newlyn Close. If this were the case, it would result in 15.38% of HMO provision within Newlyn Close which would marginally exceed the 15% limit set out within Policy DMH5 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two. The application was recommended for approval as it complied with policy in respect of parking, access, amenity and living conditions. The impact on the amenity of neighbours was a matter for further debate.

Councillors expressed concern that, although the proposed HMO would be for 6 people initially, numbers could increase in the future. It was noted that the Close was a quiet and small cul-de-sac which comprised of only 13 houses; many residents were elderly. Members felt that an additional HMO in the Close would have a detrimental impact on neighbouring residents in terms of noise and disturbance and were minded to overturn the officer's recommendation and refuse the application. Reasons for refusal would be 1) harm to the amenity of neighbours in terms of noise and disturbance which would be exacerbated by a concentration of HMOs in the cul-de-sac and 2) site restraints in such a small road. The Committee agreed to delegate authority to the Head of Planning to word the reasons for refusal.

Members moved a motion to overturn the officer's recommendation and refuse the

application. This was seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED That:

- 1) That had a non-determination appeal not been received the application would have been refused; and
- 2) Delegated authority be granted to the Head of Planning to word the reasons for refusal which will be defended at appeal.

131. **10 FRAYS AVENUE, WEST DRAYTON - 5235/APP/2020/2411** (*Agenda Item 8*)

Single storey front extension, single storey side/rear extension and conversion of roof space to include 2 side dormers and conversion and extension of rear of roof from hip to gable end.

Councillor Janet Duncan had expressed a non-pecuniary interest in this item therefore did not participate in the debate or the vote. Officers introduced the application noting that the application site was within an Area of Special Local Character (ASLC). It was felt that the proposed development would not be in keeping with the existing property or with adjoining properties and would be excessively large. The impact on adjacent occupiers was deemed to be unacceptable.

Written representations had been received from the lead petitioner and were read out to the Committee. Key points raised included:

- The proposed side/rear extension would be detrimental to the amenity of the adjoining occupier at no.8 in terms of loss of light, outlook and overdominance;
- The proposed side addition would result in development spanning almost the entire depth of the property. Any roof / guttering maintenance would necessitate accessing the neighbouring property at no.8;
- The current side extension was a 4.5 inch single brick lean to with a plastic roof; not an established structure;
- The overall development would not be subordinate to the original dwelling, engulfing the original built form, resulting in an adverse impact on the character, appearance and quality of the street scene;
- There was only space for one car to the front, not two as suggested in the planning officer's report;
- The rear development would reduce the size of the rear garden which would be inappropriate for a 5-bed house.

Written representations had also been received from the agent and were read out to the Committee. Key points raised included:

- The street scene surrounding the application site was predominantly residential with a mix of properties of various sizes and designs;
- There were large double storey properties opposite the application site therefore the impact of the proposed development would be negligible;
- The extension was located outside flood zones;
- The Environment Agency had raised no objections to the application and the development site was outside the 8m buffer zone to the river;
- Although part of the proposed design did not fully comply with Council guidelines, each application should be considered on its merits. The proposal complied with guidelines in terms of its height which would not exceed the height

of the existing property;

- A recent application at no. 45 Frays Avenue had been approved – in this case a bungalow had been demolished to allow for a double storey extension. The proposed scheme at no.10 was more environmentally friendly and a less disruptive option than demolishing and rebuilding.

Written representations had been received from Ward Councillor Jan Sweeting and were read out to the Committee. Key points raised included:

- The proposed development would not be in keeping with the ASLC due to its size, bulk and dominating appearance. It would have a devastating impact on the character and appearance of the ASLC;
- The proposal would be out of character with the low rise development characteristic of the Garden City;
- The development would have a negative impact on neighbours; particularly no.8;
- It would set an unacceptable precedent and result in further erosion of the ASLC;
- It would fail to remain subordinate to the original building;
- There would be a loss of light and outlook to no.8 Frays Avenue;
- The amenity space would be insufficient for a 5-bedroom property;
- The roof alterations and extensions would not harmonise with the original building;
- The front amenity space was too small to accommodate 2 cars.

Councillor Stuart Mathers has also submitted written representations echoing the comments made by Councillor Jan Sweeting. These were read out to the Committee.

In response to requests for clarification from the Committee, it was confirmed that it would not be feasible to add another reason for refusal in relation to parking since two cars could be accommodated.

Members had no further queries and felt the proposal was wholly unacceptable.

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

RESOLVED That: the application be refused.

132. **27 FURZEHAM ROAD, WEST DRAYTON - 71589/APP/2020/2931** (*Agenda Item 9*)

Two storey side extension, part two storey, part single storey rear extension.

Officers introduced the application noting their concerns regarding the proposed design and its impact on neighbouring properties. It was felt that the proposed development would be overbearing and would result in the loss of the original character of the property. The application was recommended for refusal.

A petition in objection to the application had been received. The lead petitioner's written representations were read out for the consideration of the Committee. Key points highlighted included:

- There was no parking space to the front of the proposed development site and

no option to create additional spaces there. The residents did not want the lamppost to be removed;

- The proposed development would not be in keeping with the rest of the street;
- Residents in Ruffles Close would have less sunlight in their gardens and their properties would be overlooked;
- The development would exacerbate sewage and water pressure problems;
- There was the potential for the development to be converted to an HMO at a later stage which would put further pressure on parking. HMOs already existed in the street and, in the past, tenants had been disrespectful and noisy.

Written representations had also been received from Councillor Jan Sweeting, Ward Councillor. These were read out for the consideration of Committee Members. Key points highlighted included:

- The proposal would be a significant overdevelopment of the site and would have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the street scene;
- The development would not be subordinate to the main dwelling;
- The appearance of the original Victorian dwelling would be lost forever;
- The roof design would be intrusive and overpowering;
- The development would have an adverse impact on neighbouring properties in Furzeham Road and Ruffles Close;
- The development would create a property of excessive size and bulk out of character with the neighbouring attractive houses.

Members noted that there were very clear reasons for refusal in this case; namely the impact on neighbours, non-compliance with policy and a proposed development which would not be in keeping with the local area. Moreover, off street parking could not be provided which would add to parking stress along the road.

Members concurred with the officer's recommendation which was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED That: the application be refused.

133. **NAVNAT CENTRE, PRINTING HOUSE LANE, HAYES - 4210/APP/2020/2379**
(Agenda Item 10)

Proposed extension to rear to create new dining hall and garden terrace and single storey side extension for ancillary use as a library, IT area and storage.

Officers presented the application which was considered appropriate development within the Green Belt. It was felt that the impact of the development would be limited and the application was recommended for approval. It was noted that there was significant planning history at the site and part of what was being presented had already been approved under previous planning applications.

Members expressed concern that the site was becoming excessively large within a Green Belt area. In response to questions from the Committee, it was confirmed that the development would be used as a community centre rather than for commercial purposes. At the request of Members, it was agreed that an informative be included stating that no further extensions would be supported on this Green Belt site. At the request of the Committee, it was further agreed that Condition 7 be strengthened to restrict the use of the development so it could not be used for commercial purposes in

the future.

Members were in support of the proposal, subject to the discussed amendments.

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

RESOLVED That:

- 1) **The application be approved; and**
- 2) **Delegated authority be granted to the Head of Planning, in consultation with the Chairman and the Labour Lead, to strengthen Condition 7 in respect of 'use' and to draft an informative indicating that any further planning applications would not be supported on this Green Belt site.**

134. **HILLINGDON GARDEN CENTRE, PIELD HEATH ROAD - 13831/APP/2020/2469**
(Agenda Item 11)

Variation of Condition 1 of planning permission Reference: 13831/APP/2017/1217 dated 18/09/2018 (Temporary change of use from garden centre to parking for Hillingdon Hospital staff) to allow an additional period of two years.

Officers introduced the application explaining that an extension was requested as the time limit had expired.

Members were in support of the application noting that parking for hospital staff was much needed. Councillors enquired whether it would be possible to extend the parking arrangements for a period of five years, rather than two, noting that staff parking would be required while the hospital was being redeveloped. It was agreed that delegated authority be granted to the Head of Planning to explore this option further and take all the necessary procedural steps. It was anticipated that there would be no objections to this five-year proposal.

Members expressed support for the proposal, preferably for an extended five-year period. The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED That:

- 1) **The application be approved; and**
- 2) **Delegated authority be granted to the Head of Planning to explore the possibility of extending the permission to 5 years rather than 2 years.**

135. **HAYES PARK, HAYES END ROAD, HAYES - 12853/APP/2020/2981** (Agenda Item 12)

Erection and installation of external cycle storage, trim trail and outdoor seating.

Officers presented the application which was recommended for approval.

Members were in support of this application, noting that fitness was vitally important. 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.

136. **WESTCOMBE HOUSE, 36-38 WINDSOR STREET, UXBRIDGE - 13544/APP/2020/1701** (*Agenda Item 13*)

Retention of show flat for Westcombe House as a self-contained residential unit (C3 use).

Officers presented the application which sought planning permission for the retention of a show flat for Westcombe House as a self-contained residential unit (C3 use). The proposed flat would be located in a locally listed building. The area was originally intended to be a lobby serving the residential development; however, it could not provide a level threshold to the flats due to the step outside the main external door. The proposed flat would provide a satisfactory living environment and would be acceptable in conservation terms and subject to a S106 agreement being completed restricting the future occupants from obtaining a parking permit. The application was recommended for approval.

Committee Members sought reassurance that the small outside area on the corner of the development could be treated appropriately to protect the amenity of future tenants in terms of sound proofing and to prevent antisocial behaviour. Members were advised that this area could not be closed off entirely as this would impact on the external appearance of this listed building. At the request of Members, it was agreed that authority be granted to the Head of Planning to explore the possible options to protect future tenants.

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

RESOLVED That:

- 1) The application be approved; and**
- 2) Delegated authority be granted to the Head of Planning to explore options in terms of the open external area to protect future tenants.**

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

RESOLVED:

- 1. That the enforcement action, as recommended in the officer's report, was agreed (to be enacted within a 6 week period); 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 declared as exempt from publication as it involves the disclosure of information in accordance with Section 100(A) and **paragraphs 1, 2 & 7** of Part 1 of Schedule 12 (A) to the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended), in that the report contains **information relating to any individual, information likely to reveal the identity of an individual and information relating to any action taken or to be taken in connection with the prevention, investigation or prosecution of crime**

and that the public interest in withholding the information outweighs the public interest in disclosing it.

138. **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 declared as exempt from publication as it involves the disclosure of information in accordance with Section 100(A) and **paragraphs 1, 2 & 7** of Part 1 of Schedule 12 (A) to the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended), in that the report contains **information relating to any individual, information likely to reveal the identity of an individual and information relating to any action taken or to be taken in connection with the prevention, investigation or prosecution of crime** and that the public interest in withholding the information outweighs the public interest in disclosing it.

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

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 declared as exempt from publication as it involves the disclosure of information in accordance with Section 100(A) and **paragraphs 1, 2 & 7** of Part 1 of Schedule 12 (A) to the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended), in that the report contains **information relating to any individual, information likely to reveal the identity of an individual and information relating to any action taken or to be taken in connection with the prevention, investigation or prosecution of crime** and that the public interest in withholding the information outweighs the public interest in disclosing it.

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

141. **ENFORCEMENT REPORT** (*Agenda Item 18*)

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 declared as exempt from publication as it involves the disclosure of information in accordance with Section 100(A) and **paragraphs 1, 2 & 7** of Part 1 of Schedule 12 (A) to the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended), in that the report contains **information relating to any individual, information likely to reveal the identity of an individual and information relating to any action taken or to be taken in connection with the prevention, investigation or prosecution of crime** and that the public interest in withholding the information outweighs the public interest in disclosing it.

142. **ENFORCEMENT REPORT** (*Agenda Item 19*)

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 declared as exempt from publication as it involves the disclosure of information in accordance with Section 100(A) and **paragraphs 1, 2 & 7** of Part 1 of Schedule 12 (A) to the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended), in that the report contains **information relating to any individual, information likely to reveal the identity of an individual and information relating to any action taken or to be taken in connection with the prevention, investigation or prosecution of crime** and that the public interest in withholding the information outweighs the public interest in disclosing it.

The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 9.33 pm.

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Liz Penny on Telephone 01895 250636 - email: epenny@hillington.gov.uk. 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.