

At a meeting of the Heston and Cranford Area Committee (Planning) held on Thursday, 12 January 2006 at 7:30 pm at Civic Centre, Lampton Road, Hounslow.

Present:

Councillors Bath, Chaudhary, Dhillon,G, Gill,M, Gill,S, Gill,SCS, Kad, Lal, Mann, Sangha and Vaught.

Apologies for Absence

Councillors Hughes,E.

109. Apologies for absence, declarations of prejudicial interest or any other communications by Members

- a) Councillor SCS Gill declared that he had received communications concerning 149 Ringway, Southall (item 9 on the agenda).
- b) Councillor M. Gill declared that he had received communications concerning 1 Charles Street, Hounslow (item 6 on the agenda).
- c) Councillor Bath declared that he had received communications concerning 149 Ringway, Southall (item 9 on the agenda).
- d) Councillor Chaudhary declared that he had received communications concerning 149 Ringway, Southall (item 9 on the agenda).
- e) Councillor Vaught declared that she had received communications concerning 1 Charles Street, Hounslow (item 6 on the agenda).
- f) Councillor Mann declared that he had received communications concerning all of the applications on the agenda.
- g) Councillor Dhillon declared that he lived at 8 Basildene Road, Hounslow, but did not feel that this was so significant that it was likely to prejudice his judgement of the public interest concerning 44 Basildene Road, Hounslow (item 8 on the agenda).
- h) Councillor Kad declared that he had received communications concerning 728 Bath Road, Hounslow; 149 Ringway, Southall and 70 St Paul's Close, Hounslow (items 7, 9 & 10 on the agenda).
- i) Councillor S. Gill declared that he had received communications concerning 728 Bath Road, Hounslow; 149 Ringway, Southall and 70 St Paul's Close, Hounslow (items 7, 9 & 10 on the agenda).

110. Minutes of the meeting held on 15 December 2005

The minutes of the meeting held on 15 December 2005 (agenda item 2) were agreed, with the following amendment:

Councillor Mann advised that he had declared that he had received communications from all of the applicants, which had not been recorded. He noted that the advice given at the meeting was for Members to declare their interest on every item, but it was his preference to declare en masse.

111. 1 Charles Street, Hounslow - Planning Application No.00234/1/P3

See report by the Director of Planning (agenda item 6).

With the permission of the Chair, Mr Aujla, the applicant's agent, stated that the proposals had been reduced to comply with the Council's planning policy. He had visited the site on the previous day to mark out the area for the extension and to reassure the neighbour that it would not encroach onto his property. In response to a question, Mr Aujla advised that he had spoken to the neighbour, who had agreed that the proposals would not encroach onto his property.

With the permission of the Chair, Mr Smith spoke in objection to the proposals. He raised the following points:

- The side extension would block out natural sunlight to his garden.
- The rear extension would butt up to the privet hedge at the side.
- The side and rear extension would have a claustrophobic effect on his property.
- The side extension would remove 1 parking space and add pressure onto parking on the road.
- The appearance from the front would not be in keeping with properties in the area.
- The plans had different measurement heights.
- A tree would need to be removed if the rear extension was built.
- Access to the main sewer would be removed.
- Planning permission had previously been refused on two occasions because the appearance would harm the appearance of the area.
- The builder had taken measurements in 2005 and found that the proposals would encroach onto his land.

In response to questions, Mr Smith advised that he had not agreed with the applicant's agent that the measurements did not encroach onto his land. He had not seen the new plans and had been informed by the planning officer that the plans were the same.

Robert Coomber, Area Planning Manager, advised that the proposals complied with planning guidelines. There would be no loss of light and the land registry plan, submitted by the applicant, has satisfied officers that the proposals would not encroach onto the neighbour's land; it would be a matter to be resolved under the Party Wall Act and not Planning Law if trespass did occur. Mr Smith had not been consulted over the new plan because the difference between the original plan and the new one would not have made any difference to his complaints.

Members felt that Mr Smith's concerns had been addressed in the officer's report to the Committee.

Resolved:

That the erection of a single storey side and rear extension to No. 1 Charles Street, Hounslow be approved, subject to the conditions set out in the report.

112. 44 Basildene Road, Hounslow - Planning Application No.00081/44/P2

See report by the Director of Planning (agenda item 8)

With the permission of the Chair, Mr Khan, the applicant, stated that he had 12 multiple occupation properties in Isleworth and Cranford, all of which had planning permission. 9 properties had been refused planning permission by the Council, but had been overturned on appeal at a cost to both the Council and Mr Khan. All of Mr Khan's tenants were placements from the Council's Homeless Persons Unit.

Councillor Mann raised concerns that Members would have a prejudicial interest in adjudicating over the application because the Homeless Persons Unit was placing tenants in the property, which was a service provided by the Council. Chris Wark, the Solicitor, advised that there was no personal interest by any individual Members and therefore, no prejudicial interest. Robert Coomber added that the Council had to adjudicate on planning applications from Council services, for example, extensions to schools. The report was written by the Planning Department and decided by a Planning Committee to prevent any influence from another department.

With the permission of the Chair, Mr Saini spoke in objection to the application. He raised the following points:

- 6 residents would create more noise and disturbance than a family of 6 because a family was rooted in the area.
- Residents were only staying at the property for a few months, which meant that there could be potentially 30 different people living at the property throughout the year.
- There were 4 multi-occupancy properties within a mile radius, which was disproportionate to the area.
- It was not known if checks were carried out on the residents' backgrounds before they were housed.
- Works had been carried out without permission.
- The new side window had been installed in 2005 and not 1976, as stated in the report and overlooked the house and garden.
- The side door was dangerous because it opened onto the driveway.

Mr Coomber stressed that the property was not a bed & breakfast, but short-term accommodation and the Homeless Persons Unit had stated that there was a shortage of this type of accommodation. The Council had refused permission for similar applications in the past on the grounds that they would have harmful effects on the neighbours, but had not won any of the appeals. There were several houses in multiple occupation in the Borough, but they were not overwhelming in this area. Conditions could be included in the planning permission to address concerns over the storage of refuse, forecourt landscaping, restricted occupation, security measures, retention of the garage for parking and removal of the side door. The window and door faced the garden fence to the south and so, although the houses were staggered, there would be no loss of privacy from the window.

In response to a question, Adam Beamish, Planning Enforcement Officer, advised that there had been no breach in planning control at the property in respect of the side window and door.

Members noted that it had been stated in the report that the policy did not encourage provision of further accommodation of this type and felt that a needs analysis should be provided to show the existing and anticipated need. They raised concerns over inadequate parking, future increases in the number of residents and the harmful impact on neighbouring properties. They felt that there should be wider consultation than the 8 neighbours notified and that multi-occupancy was similar to bed & breakfast accommodation. Members were aware of the potential costs to the Council if the application was refused and upheld on appeal, but felt that there would be harm to the neighbours living conditions if the application was approved.

Robert Coomber advised that the Homeless Persons Unit had a statutory duty to house homeless people and had stated that there was a desperate need for this type of accommodation. It had been recommended that 1 parking space be retained and a condition attached for the retention of the garage for parking purposes. He stated that, in his experience, not many homeless people were car owners. The proposals differed from a bed & breakfast guest-house because only a small degree of care was provided in compliance with Government requirements, there was no manager on site, no commercial provision and only homeless people, referred by the Council, could stay there.

Resolved:

That the continued use as a house in multiple occupation for six persons at No. 44 Basildene Road, Hounslow be deferred to allow for more information to be provided by the Homeless Persons Unit, to allow Members the opportunity to visit the site and for wider consultation to take place.

113. Appeal Crossover Application, 94 Lela Avenue, Hounslow

See report by the Head of Street Management & Public Protection (agenda item 15)

Members acknowledged that the UDP guidelines did not apply to crossovers, but felt that the principle of allowing exceptions for special needs should be the same.

Resolved:

That the appeal for a crossover at No.94 Lela Avenue, Hounslow be upheld because of the special needs of the occupant.

114. 728 Bath Road, Hounslow - Planning Application No.00083/728/P5

See report by the Director of Planning (agenda item 7)

Resolved:

That the erection of a detached single storey storage building ancillary to No. 728 Bath Road, Hounslow be approved, subject to the conditions set out in the report.

115. 149 Ringway, Southall

See report by the Director of Planning (agenda item 9)

Members advised that they had received correspondence from the occupant, including medical records and an indication that she was willing to comply with officer's recommendations. Adam Beamish advised that he had not received the documents provided to Members, but had been told by the occupant that she was unwilling to remove the second extension.

Resolved:

That enforcement action for the demolition of the single storey rear extension to No. 149 The Ringway, Southall be deferred to allow for further negotiations between officers and the owner of the property.

116. 70 St Paul's Close, Hounslow

See report by the Director of Planning (agenda item 10)

Resolved:

That enforcement action for the demolition of the front canopy at No.70 St Paul's Close, Hounslow be refused because no enforcement action had been taken against a similar canopy on a property nearby.

117. 174 Ash Grove, Heston

See report by the Director of Planning (agenda item 11)

Resolved:

That enforcement action for the demolition of the porch to No.174 Ash Grove, Heston be agreed for the reasons set out in the report.

118. 43 Summerhouse Avenue, Heston

See report by the Director of Planning (agenda item 12)

Members noted that there had been a lot of enforcement cases brought to the Committee and felt that more could be done to make residents aware of planning procedures. They requested that the matter be brought to the attention of the Planning Department and suggested that information be provided in the Council's hm magazine in a range of languages to ensure that all members of the community were made aware.

Resolved:

That enforcement action for the demolition of the second single storey extension to No.43 Summerhouse Avenue, Heston be agreed for the reasons set out in the report.

119. Conservation Area Character Appraisals

See report by the Conservation Officer (agenda item 13)

The report was noted.

120. Delegated Decisions

See report by the Director of Planning (agenda item 14)

The report was noted.

The meeting finished at 9:10 pm.