

## MINUTES OF DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

### DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

Monday 14<sup>th</sup> March 2016

7:00pm – RVS Offices, The Harlington

**Present:** Cllr Pierce - Chairman  
 Cllr Schofield  
 Cllr Holt  
 Cllr Jasper  
 Cllr Hope  
 Cllr Gotel

**Officers:** Charlotte Benham – Planning Committee Clerk

1	<p><b>Apologies</b></p> <p>Apologies were received from Cllr Robinson and Wright.</p>
2	<p><b>Declarations of interest to any item on the agenda</b></p> <p>Cllr Jasper declared an interest in application 16/00108/PRIOR.</p>
3.	<p><b>Public Session</b></p> <p>Two members of the public were present: Phil Gower and Colin Gray from FCCS.</p>
4	<p><b>Approval of the Minutes</b></p> <p>The minutes of the Development and Control and Planning meetings held on Monday 22<sup>nd</sup> February were accepted as correct records of the meetings.</p>
5	<p><b>Current Applications to be Considered:</b></p> <p><b>16/00358/HOU</b>        2 Gorseway        Single storey rear extension        Comments required by 15<sup>th</sup> March</p> <p><b>OBJECTION</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Size of modified garage no longer meets Hart's regulations, therefore a parking plan that meets Hart's standards for a 4 bedroom house needs to be submitted</li> <li>• Concern about potential damage to the roots of a mature tree during works; tree protection plan required.</li> </ul>

**16/00166/HOU**

1 Sycamore Crescent

Temporary retention of 2 metre high boundary fence. Retrospective application.

Comments required by 16<sup>th</sup> March

**OBJECTION**

- The word temporary is misleading, planning permission is permanent.
- Parking is now inadequate with the loss of two garage spaces.
- Proposed plans are out of keeping with the local environment– proposals for a high fence disrupts the open plan setting of the immediate area.
- Reduced visibility due to the advance of the fence to the limit of the property boundary creates a traffic hazard at the road junction.

**16/00235/HOU**

14 Aldershot Road

Second storey rear extension and front dormer

Comments required by 16<sup>th</sup> March

No objection to the proposed front dormer

**OBJECTION**

- To the bulk and mass of the rear elevation. If reduced it would be more acceptable

**16/00293/FUL**

102-104 Fleet Road

Demolition of part of existing building, use of part ground and part first floor for Use Class A1 or A2, and roof extension accommodating 2 x 2-bedroom residential units, formation of new parking spaces

Comments required by 21<sup>st</sup> March

**OBJECTION**

- Concern that the modified building was never submitted to FTC or HDC for planning permission (supposedly demolished and rebuilt as original building)
- Bulk and mass of the proposed new development, with the loss of a character façade, negative impact on the street scene.
- Parking is totally inadequate for both support of the commercial/retail space and residential use (2 x 1 bedroom units and 2 x 2 bedroom units. Units 102 to 108 have to be considered in combination.
- Car parking spaces are too small, not compliant with HDC's parking standards.
- Car parking space 10 blocks the entrance/exit to the underground carpark to the proposed neighbouring block of flats

**16/00409/HOU**

30 Kent Road

Erection of first floor extensions to the side and rear of the existing detached house, together with creation of two additional pitched roof dormer windows to rear elevation, and one additional pitched roof dormer window at front elevation

Comments required by 22<sup>nd</sup> March

**Concern** – proposed plans will increase mass of building close to the pavement and on an exposed corner, result may be out of keeping with the otherwise open character of the area.

**16/00405/FUL**

70 Kings Road

Erection of detached 5 Bedroom detached dwelling with integral garage on land adjacent to existing dwelling at 70 Kings Road

Comments required by 22<sup>nd</sup> March

**OBJECTION**

- Question whether a flood assessment should be required?
- Concern drawings are not accurate. The location/block plan and street scene representations do not comply with other drawings in the submission
- The building and the plot appear to be the same size – a dimensional survey should be submitted
- Overdevelopment of site
- Proposed tiles/rendering and architectural finishes would be out of keeping with street scene.

**16/00108/PRIOR**

10 Kings Road

Notification for Prior Approval for a proposed change of use of a building from A1 to C3

Comments required by 23<sup>rd</sup> March

**OBJECTION**

- Parking is inadequate – a minimum of 10 spaces are required under Hart's standards. Concern about impact on traffic as limited on-street parking space in immediate vicinity.
- Proposed plans would result in a residential unit on a commercial parade. Should be retained as commercial/retail use.

**16/00434/FUL**

189-191 Fleet Road

Installation of new shop front to replace existing , together with the installation of new aluminium cladding to columns and new fascia board at higher level, the removal of existing timber slats and the installation of a new sliding entrance door, and the installation of 1No. internal LCD promotional screen behind the new shopfront

Comments required by 23<sup>rd</sup> March

**OBJECTION**

- Negative, overpowering impact on the street scene
- The large vertical banner (Hong Kong sign) will be visually intrusive along the high street
- Proposed 'McDonalds' text sign is too large, (current size is a better design)

**16/00436/ADV**

189 - 191 Fleet Road

Erection and display of one new high level projecting banner sign with internally illuminated golden arch symbol on non-illuminated background

Comments required by 24<sup>th</sup> March

**OBJECTION**

- Negative, overpowering impact on the street scene
- The large vertical banner (Hong Kong sign) will be visually intrusive along the high street
- Proposed 'McDonalds' text sign is too large, (current size is a better design)

**16/00435/ADV**

189-191 Fleet Road

Erection and display of 2No. Internally illuminated fascia signs with Golden Arch symbol and Mcdonalds text, and 1No. internally illuminated projecting sign (with Golden Arch text) to replace to existing signs

Comments required by 24<sup>th</sup> March

**OBJECTION**

- Negative, overpowering impact on the street scene
- The large vertical banner (Hong Kong sign) will be visually intrusive along the high street
- Proposed 'McDonalds' text sign is too large, (current size is a better design)

**16/00473/HOU**

25 Elms Road

Single storey rear extension to link house and garden room. (Alterations to roof structure/size to that approved under 15/02035/HOU)

Comments required by 23<sup>rd</sup> March

**OBJECTION**

- Parking is inadequate – 3 in row is not accepted under Hart's parking standards
- Parking is impractical – question whether you would be able to open car doors in narrow access alongside the building. There exists an on-road parking problem in Elms Road
- Concern shower/toilet in close proximity to "Garden room" will result in later use as a bedroom.

**16/00510/HOU**

26 Albany Road

Single Storey Front Extension

Comments required by 25<sup>th</sup> March

**OBJECTION**

- Proposed plans are out of keeping on a building of historic interest
- Parking is inadequate - may be restricted with extension, so a parking plan should be submitted to meet HDC's requirements
- The proposed utility room on the front of the building negatively impacts the design and appearance of the front elevation. The removal of this appendage would render the proposal more acceptable and in-keeping with the existing building.

**16/00536/HOU**

2 Larchfield Road

Single storey rear extension

Comments required by 30<sup>th</sup> March

**NO OBJECTION****16/00542/HOU**

11 Spruce Way

Erection of front and rear extensions

Comments required by 30<sup>th</sup> March

**Concern:**

- the front extension is too large and extends too far forward.
- Tree should be protected during works

**16/00268/ADV**

235 Fleet Road

New 1no fascia & new 1no projecting sign

Comments required by 31<sup>st</sup> March

	<p><b>NO OBJECTION</b> But confusion as to where the sign on a hanging chain will be located</p> <p><b>16/00269/FUL</b> 235 Fleet Road Removal of existing shopfront &amp; 1nO entrance door (rhs) &amp; installation of new shopfront &amp; 1nO entrance door (rhs) Comments required by 31<sup>st</sup> March</p> <p><b>Applications due before meeting:</b></p> <p><b>16/00034/HOU</b> 10 Greenways Erection of a two storey side extension Comments required by 1<sup>st</sup> March Amended plans: Revised roof design Previous comments 10<sup>th</sup> Feb 2016 OBJECTION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Possible breach of the 45 degree rule</li> <li>• Concern parking is not practical as garage is too tight</li> <li>• A parking plan that meets Hart's standards should be submitted</li> </ul> <p><b>Previous comments still stand</b></p> <p><b>15/03125/HOU</b> 50 Church Road Rear of property - Single storey lowering of roofline and change of material and addition of 2 roof lights. Addition of rear single storey bay window. Front of property - Render, new windows and porch Comments required by 14<sup>th</sup> March</p> <p>Amended Plans</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Render front of property</li> <li>• Erection of a front porch</li> <li>• Replacement windows</li> </ul> <p>Previous comments 28 Jan 2016 NO OBJECTION</p> <p><b>NO OBJECTION</b> as long as changes are in keeping with street scene</p>
6	<p><b>Noted:</b></p> <p>The weekly lists were noted</p>
7	<p><b>Planning Appeal:</b></p> <p><b>15/02402/FUL</b> Fleet Baptist Church, 115 Clarence Road Demolition of existing buildings and erection of building containing 12 x 2-bed flats with associated car parking, cycle storage and bin stores. Re-submission of application reference: 15/00969/FUL</p> <p><b>15/01211/FUL</b> 159 Albert Street</p>

	<p>Erection of a three bedroom chalet and a pair of semi-detached two bedroom houses following demolition of the existing house</p> <p><b>Enforcement Cases received:</b></p> <p><b>16/00039/CONDS</b>  Complainant: PUBLIC  Sainsbury's, 150 - 156 Aldershot Road  Complaint: Possible breach of condition 4 of 13/02463/FUL  Status: PCO</p> <p><b>Enforcement Cases closed:</b></p> <p><b>15/00102/HOME</b>  15 Sycamore Crescent  Complaint: Alleged business from home and creation of lean to for storage  Conclusion: Not Expedient to take enforcement action</p> <p><b>15/00392/COU</b>  Tamworth Drive  Complaint: Flat being used as House of Multiple Occupancy  Conclusion: Not a breach of planning control</p> <p><b>16/00013/CONDS</b>  44 Elvetham Road  Complaint: Compliance check for 14/01501/FUL  Conclusion: Not a breach of planning control</p>
8	<p><b>Noted:</b></p> <p><b>Hart Planning Meeting Dates</b></p> <p>13<sup>th</sup> April 2016</p>
9	<p><b>Date of Next Meeting</b></p> <p>Tuesday 29<sup>th</sup> March– 7pm in the Harlington, RVS Offices</p>

**The meeting closed at 8.40pm**

**Signed:**.....

**Date:** .....