

Minutes

MINOR APPLICATIONS PLANNING COMMITTEE

2 November 2021

Meeting held at Council Chamber - Civic Centre, High Street, Uxbridge

	<p>Committee Members Present: Councillors Henry Higgins (Chairman), John Morgan (Vice-Chairman), Shehryar Ahmad-Wallana, Mohinder Birah, Nicola Brightman, Allan Kauffman and John Morse (Opposition Lead)</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: Katie Crosbie (Planning Team Leader), Kerrie Munro (Planning Lawyer), Anisha Teji (Democratic Services Officer), Alan Tilly (Transport Planning and Development Team Manager) and Roz Johnson (Planning Services Manager)</p>
57.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
58.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>Councillor Allan Kauffman declared a non-pecuniary interest in agenda item 10 - 54A Edwards Avenue, Ruislip (34282/APP/2021/1682) as he had prior involvement with residents regarding the site. He did not vote and left the room during discussion of the item.</p>
59.	<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 on 30 September 2021 be approved as an accurate record.</p>
60.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
61.	<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 – 10 were marked Part I and would be considered in public.</p>

62. **34 ASPEN GROVE, EASTCOTE - 76496/APP/2021/2303** (*Agenda Item 6*)

Single storey rear extension

Officers introduced the application and made a recommendation for approval.

The Committee was informed that the petitioner had confirmed by email that they would not be attending the meeting as the plan had been revised to remove the second story on the rear extension.

By way of written submission, the applicant's agent addressed the Committee. It was submitted that the planning permission request had reduced from a double storey rear extension to a single due to complaints from neighbouring properties. The single storey rear extension complied with policy DMHD 1 and the material used would be like the existing dwelling. It was further submitted that there would be no impact on the Green belt as the proposal was not a disproportionate addition to the original property. The proposal matched the depth of the neighbour's existing conservatory and would not have an adverse impact on the neighbour's residential amenity.

The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved as per officer's recommendation.

63. **51 SWEETCROFT LANE, HILLINGDON - 33932/APP/2021/1920** (*Agenda Item 7*)

Erection of 2 x two-storey, 4-bedroom detached dwellings, associated parking and amenity space and installation of vehicular crossovers

Officers introduced the application, highlighted the addendum and made a recommendation for approval.

A petitioner in objection of the application addressed the Committee and referred to photographs and a presentation that had been circulated to Members prior to the meeting. The main issues for objecting to the application were detailed in the presentation and related to conflict with the local character of the area, loss of amenity due to the removal of trees, lack of vehicle turning circle on proposed plans leading to an unsafe and dangerous situation, insufficient parking, objection to new access via Portman Gardens and excess traffic caused by construction. It was submitted that the proposals were not in keeping with of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 (2020) Policy DMH 6 The proposals would establish the unwelcome precedent of other sites being developed in the same way. Although the officer's report had indicated that Portman Gardens was devoid of parking control, this was incorrect and the report had been based on inaccurate information. There was no justifiable requirement to make access via Portman Gardens as the property could be accessed from the access point on Sweetcroft Lane. The residents agreed that some development to the property should be carried out but within the access to the property from Sweetcroft Lane. As part of the external consultation, 28 properties had been consulted, there had been 32 individual objections against the development and the petition had 44 signatures from residents. The Committee was asked to put residents first.

By way of written submission, the applicant's agent addressed the Committee. It was submitted that the National Planning Policy Framework encouraged the effective use of land and the use of previously developed vacant under-utilised sites to be maximised. At a local level, the plan provided support to the housing provision. Previous concerns that had been raised were now addressed in terms of the quantum of development, the

design, layout, siting and the impact the homes would have on the character and appearance of the ASLC. A number of amendments to the application had been made to the roof form, windows and removal of balconies. The applicant/agent had worked closely with officers to maintain the development pattern and character. The existing narrow and long access from Sweetcroft Lane would be closed and new access provided by extending the existing highway at Portman Gardens. Officers had confirmed that the new access, car parking, layout, cycle parking and servicing were all acceptable and did not raise any safety concerns. Further, the internal layouts complied with the floor area standards, there would also be a landscape buffer and the development would not result in any concerns relating to the loss of privacy, daylight or sunlight to any of the neighbouring properties.

Councillor David Yarrow, Ward Councillor for Uxbridge North addressed the Committee and supported the points raised by the petitioner. This was an emotive application effecting the lives of residents on Portman Gardens which was a quiet Cul De Sac. It was submitted that the application had been put before the Committee twice and the appeal had been dismissed. The size of the property had been reduced however there was more to consider than the size and number of the property. The Council had a policy around back gardens and the Committee was asked to consider the long-term effects of the proposals. There were five other properties waiting for this application to be accepted and further extension would take place if this application was approved. It was requested that a site visit take place to check the way cars travelled on existing pathways and a tree preservation order was placed on the remaining five properties. If the Committee was not minded to conduct a site visit, it was requested that the application be deferred until tree preservation orders were determined and proved to be robust.

Prior to Member discussion, Officers noted the submissions in relation to policy DMH 6 in relation to back land development and considered that the layout and design were acceptable. In relation to access from Sweetcroft Lane, it was confirmed that there was also a specific criterion in Policy DMH 6 in relation to access and access roads between dwellings and unnecessarily long access roads were unacceptable. NPPF para 203 was noted in respect of non-designated heritage assets. Officers had assessed the site and although there would be some harm, it was considered that the layout and design would present an extension of Portmans Garden. Each application needed to be considered on its own merits and it was confirmed that the area was covered by a tree preservation order. It was confirmed there was an oversight in relation to the parking restrictions in Portman Gardens in the report, however there were no highway objections to the development.

Members agreed to defer the application for a site visit to investigate the area further.

A motion to defer the application for a site visit was moved, seconded and unanimously agreed at a vote.

RESOLVED: That the application be deferred for a site visit.

64. **56 SWAN ROAD, WEST DRAYTON - 76289/APP/2021/3191** (*Agenda Item 8*)

Single storey rear extension and part first floor rear extension

Officers introduced the application and made a recommendation for approval.

A petitioner in objection of the application addressed the Committee and submitted that the application was not a true reflection of what had already been built and what was

intended. On 4 August 2021, planning consent for the application was granted on the premises that the Council would be able to gain control of the property. It was alleged that since then, the applicant had deviated from the two previously approved planning applications, acted without permission and breached planning rules. The petitioner referred the Committee to photographs that had been circulated to Members prior to the meeting and explained the significance of each photo. Scant regard had been taken of the conditions in the planning consent regarding the use of materials and there had been no adherence to the regulated hours of work. It was explained that the extension to 60 Swan Road had been built entirely on the curtilage of its own land and the original dwelling was much smaller in size. The proposed extension would overscale a neighbouring property and there were also no residents effected by the development at 60 Swan Road due to its location. There was continuous intimidation by the applicant towards the petition organiser especially whilst collecting signatures for the petition. The Committee was asked to make a choice of what was right and what is easy.

It was noted that there was an enforcement case open on the site and additional issues would be communicated to the team. However, the Committee was advised to focus on planning matters and not matters falling outside of the scope of planning, such as building regulation related issues.

The agent for the application addressed the Committee and submitted that the works were in construction further to previously approved planning permission. The proposal had been designed taking into account Hillingdon Council residential policies. The extension had no overbearing issues affecting adjoining and neighbouring properties. The flat roof helped to mitigate any overshadowing and there were no breaches in terms of windows and overlooking. The proposal complied with parking policies and the application had been assessed by planning officers. The application would not detract from the character of the area, the works would be a proportionate addition to the dwelling and there would be no harm caused to neighbouring properties. Overall, it was submitted that the proposed development to the property would result in good internal living conditions. It was reiterated that similar extensions had already been approved and built on the road, and the proposal would be in keeping with the surrounding area.

Councillor Jan Sweeting, Ward Councillor for West Drayton addressed the Committee by way of written submissions. Councillor Sweeting fully supported the residents' petition and submitted that the applications had been dealt with in an aggressive manner by the applicant. There had been no regard to rules and the Committee was referred to photographs that had been circulated prior to the meeting. The applicant had not adhered to party wall agreements and there had been no reference to the inadequacies of the parking to the property. It was submitted that the parking spaces mentioned were only possible by vehicles mounting the pavement to access the second space, and also crossing over a designated residents parking space. The Committee was asked to address the points raised prior to making a decision.

The Chairman reiterated the need to only have regard to planning considerations and the information before the Committee at the meeting.

In response to Member questions regarding the boundary dispute, the Legal Advisor advised the Committee that the matter had to be managed privately. It was not a matter for the local authority as it was not a material planning consideration.

In terms of daylight impact on neighbouring properties, it was confirmed that that sun came from the front of the house over to the back, and there was a natural overshadowing of the properties themselves.

The Committee noted that it could only consider the information before it and as such officer's recommendation was moved, seconded, and unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved as per officer's recommendation.

65. **98 LANSBURY DRIVE, HAYES - 35212/APP/2021/590** (*Agenda Item 9*)

Change of use from a tyre fitting centre to a mixed-use tyre fitting and MOT test centre (sui generis use)

Officers introduced the application, highlighted the addendum and made a recommendation for approval.

During Member discussions, it was noted that enforcement would be asked to investigate in respect of the canopy. Concerns were raised regarding traffic levels and it was acknowledged that traffic on the site would increase. However, the additional fencing around the site perimeter would increase the safety of pedestrians mitigating the traffic increase. It was agreed that condition 7 would be amended such that the required operational management plan would also include measures to minimise vehicle trips to the site.

Councillor Allan Kauffman left the room during the discussion of this item and did not take part in the vote.

The officer's recommendation, with the amendment to condition 7 was moved, seconded and unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved as per officer's recommendation, the additional information in the addendum and the amendment to condition 7.

66. **54A EDWARDS AVENUE, RUISLIP - 34282/APP/2021/1682** (*Agenda Item 10*)

Installation of front brick wall and timber panelling

Officers introduced the application and made a recommendation for approval. It was noted that four representations had been received in objection to the proposal with concerns that the property would be converted into a HMO. However, Members were advised that this application related solely to the replacement boundary. A subsequent representation had also been raised prior to the Committee raising concerns with boundary issues, however these were not material planning considerations. Disputes in relation to boundaries had to be managed privately. Informative eight of the report highlighted that planning permission did not override property rights.

The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved as per officer's recommendation.

The meeting, which commenced at 6.00 pm, closed at 7.12 pm.

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Anisha Teji on Telephone 01895 277655 - Email: ateji@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.