

# Minutes



CENTRAL & South Planning Committee

4 May 2021

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

	<p><b>Committee Members Present:</b> Councillors Steve Tuckwell (Chairman), Alan Chapman (Vice-Chairman), Shehryar Ahmad-Wallana, Mohinder Birah, Nicola Brightman, Roy Chamdal, Farhad Choubedar, Jazz Dhillon and Janet Duncan (Opposition Lead)</p> <p><b>LBH Officers Present:</b> Meghji Hirani, Planning Contracts &amp; Planning Information Kerrie Munroe, Legal Advisor Liz Penny, Democratic Services Officer James Rodger, Deputy Director of Planning and Regeneration Alan Tilly, Transport Planning and Development Manager</p>
196.	<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b> <i>(Agenda Item 1)</i></p> <p>There were no apologies for absence.</p>
197.	<p><b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING</b> <i>(Agenda Item 2)</i></p> <p>There were no declarations of interest.</p>
198.	<p><b>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING DATED 7 APRIL 2021</b> <i>(Agenda Item 3)</i></p> <p>Cllr Roy Chamdal requested that the minutes of the meeting dated 7 April 2021 be amended to indicate that he was obliged to join the previous meeting a little late due to IT issues.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b> That the minutes of the meeting dated 7 April 2021 be approved as an accurate record subject to an amendment to indicate that Cllr Roy Chamdal was obliged to join the meeting a little late due to IT issues.</p>
199.	<p><b>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT</b> <i>(Agenda Item 4)</i></p> <p>None.</p>
200.	<p><b>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</b> <i>(Agenda Item 5)</i></p> <p>It was confirmed that all items were in Part I and would be considered in public.</p>

**Erection of a two storey, 2-bed end-of-terraced dwelling involving partial demolition of existing garage**

Officers introduced the application noting that it complied with planning policy in many respects. However, the application was recommended for refusal as the proposed development would be forward of the building line and its width would not be in keeping with the street scene. Issues regarding parking were highlighted as it was felt that an inadequate level of off-street parking was proposed. Members heard that the development would also have a negative impact on protected trees.

A written representation on behalf of the applicant was read out to the Committee. Key points highlighted included:

External design

- The eastern side of De Salis Road (where the site was positioned) comprised a terrace of two storey properties of similar external appearance;
- As De Salis Road turned in a southerly direction towards Uxbridge Road, the terrace displayed a visually interesting stepped and varied building line;
- The front projection of the proposed new building would be set forward 6m of the existing building to respond positively to the unique building line of terraced properties on the eastern side of De Salis Road to the north and to provide a visual termination point at the southern end of the terrace – this replicated the stepped approach adopted at the northern end;
- The proposed dwelling would respond positively to the visual character and appearance of the terrace and wider streetscene; and
- The proposed dwelling would respond positively to the two-storey scale and height of the adjoining property and other properties forming part of the wider terrace and streetscene. The development represented a high-quality interpretation of the visual character and built form of the streetscene in accordance with Local Plan Policy DMHG11.

Impact on Trees

- The applicant had submitted a professional Tree Report which demonstrated that it would be possible to carry out the development without removing any existing trees. The Council's Tree Officer was in agreement with this; and
- Since there were no windows on the proposed southern side elevation, there would be no pressure from occupiers to remove the trees in the future. It would be unreasonable to refuse the application on this basis.

Parking

- Space for 2 off road car parking spaces would be retained within the front curtilage of 2 De Salis Road – in accordance with required standards for a 3-bed property;
- Space would be provided within the front curtilage of the new 2-bed dwelling for a single parking space in accordance with the Council's parking standards; and
- Paragraph 109 of the NPPF stated that development should only be prevented on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety or the cumulative impact on the road network would be severe. There was no justification to refuse the scheme on highways grounds.

Members expressed concern regarding the proposal observing that the site was too small for such a development. It was also felt that the application site was too close to nearby trees and parking was inadequate. It was noted that the proposed building would be totally in front of the adjoining property and this was considered unacceptable.

The Committee pointed out that orientation was a matter of further concern in this case. The development site was north facing hence the proposal could lead to overshadowing and an unacceptable sunlight / daylight impact to neighbouring properties. The 45° angle to habitable windows was also raised as a potential area of concern which required further exploration. At the request of Members, it was agreed that authority be delegated to the Head of Planning to explore the possibility of drafting an additional reason for refusal in relation to orientation and the 45° angle to habitable windows.

The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously agreed, subject to the exploration of an additional reason for refusal as discussed.

**RESOLVED:**

- 1) **That the application be refused; and**
- 2) **That delegated authority be granted to the Head of Planning to explore the possibility of drafting an additional reason for refusal in relation to orientation and the 45° angle to habitable windows.**

**202. 43 SWEETCROFT LANE, HILLINGDON - 17412/APP/2021/599 (Agenda Item 7)**

**Variation of condition 2 (Approved Plans) of planning permission Ref: 17412/APP/2019/2186 dated 16/10/2019 (single storey side extensions, single storey rear extension and conversion of roofspace to habitable use to include raising of ridge of roof, 6 side dormers, 5 side rooflights and extension and conversion of front and rear of roof from hip to gable end with new gable end windows) to allow for additional windows and to enable the roofspace to be used for additional living accommodation.**

Officers introduced the application informing Members that the size and design would not be altered but changes to fenestration were proposed which were considered unacceptable. The application was recommended for refusal. Members were requested to agree the rewording of the existing reason for refusal to include reference to "Hillingdon Court Park Area of Special Local Character and the surrounding area."

A written representation on behalf of the petitioners was read out to the Committee. Key points highlighted included:

- Neighbours wished to retain the character of the area and reduce the impact on residents. The officer's report recommending refusal was welcomed but outstanding concerns were raised in relation to neighbour impact, transparency, discrepancies, privacy, landscaping, owner obligations and multiple applications;
- The report stated that the proposed changes would not impact negatively on neighbours. This was disputed as it was felt that the increase in glazing had already resulted in significant loss of privacy and this would be exacerbated by the current application;
- Residents had been assured that their objections had been reviewed but had

seen no proof of this. A copy of the officer's complete report which considered fully all neighbour representations and comments both for this and previous applications was requested to ensure transparency of decision-making;

- There was a discrepancy in the number of rooflights described and the number on the drawings both for this and a previous application. The number of rooflights already constructed illegally on site exceeded both sets of numbers. The Planning Committee was requested to reconcile what had been approved with what had been constructed without consent;
- The main concern related to privacy. The Council had requested that all windows facing 39 and 47 be obscured and non-opening below 1.8m from floor level. The owner had ignored this and had installed clear glass fully openable windows. The current application requested that obscured glass restriction be limited to first floor only with glazing to the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor being clear. Petitioners requested that the existing planning consent be maintained and no relaxation entertained. High level clear unobscured glass to the north elevation at 2<sup>nd</sup> floor level would compromise the privacy of neighbours at numbers 41, 45 and 45A, therefore mandatory obscured glass on all higher level elevations was requested;
- Planning officers were requested to impose a landscaping obligation on the owner to replace the planting destroyed during construction and reinforce the planting to boundaries to reinstate the privacy previously enjoyed;
- Owner obligations regarding working hours, noise, site fires etc were regularly being breached. Site inspections were requested to control these repeated breaches of planning consents; and
- Multiple applications and the Council's approval of ambiguous applications had encouraged the owner to pursue further retrospective applications.

A short written submission from Ward Councillor Ray Graham was read out requesting that the Committee endorse the refusal recommendation in the officer's report for the reasons given.

The Head of Planning addressed Members noting that enforcement matters relating to construction without consent did not pertain to this Committee and would be addressed separately. Residents' concerns regarding overlooking were noted, but excessive fenestration was considered to be the main reason for a refusal recommendation.

Members cited a similar example of excessive fenestration in Thornhill Road, Ickenham. It was believed that this was already being investigated by enforcement officers. The legal advisor highlighted the requirement to focus on the current application only and not consider other unrelated matters.

The Committee expressed concern regarding the proposed second floor loft area which would have extensive glazing both to the front and the rear plus additional rooflights. It was felt that this would lead to overlooking to neighbours' properties. At the request of Members, it was agreed that the matter of overlooking be added to the reasons for refusal. It was considered that, should it go to appeal, this decision could be defended given the extent of the glazing proposed.

Members noted that there appeared to be some inconsistencies in the plans as set out in the pack. An informative was requested in relation to this.

The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously agreed subject to the agreed amendments to reasons for refusal and an informative in relation to discrepancies in the plans.

**RESOLVED:**

- 1) That the application be refused; and
- 2) That delegated authority be granted to the Head of Planning, in consultation with the Chairman and Labour Lead, to reword the existing reason for refusal to include reference to the ASLC; add a second reason for refusal on the basis of overlooking; and check the accuracy of the plans and add an informative in relation to this.

203.	<b>HEINZ WOLFF BUILDING, BRUNEL UNIVERSITY - 532/APP/2021/330</b> ( <i>Agenda Item 8</i> )
	<b>Internal re-modelling of the ground floor and east wing and first floor west wing and installation of new plant equipment on various surfaces of the exterior of the building.</b>
	<p>Officers presented the application. Members noted that the majority of the proposed works were on the interior with minimal exterior impact. There was no major visual impact and the changes were minor. Members raised no concerns of objections.</p> <p>The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.</p>
	<b>RESOLVED: That the application be approved.</b>
204.	<b>HARMONDSWORTH LANDFILL SITE, HARMONDSWORTH LANE - 43155/APP/2020/4267</b> ( <i>Agenda Item 9</i> )
	<b>The installation of a leachate pre-treatment plant and piped connection to sewer at Harmondsworth closed landfill site</b>
	<p>Officers introduced the report advising Members that the application related to a decommissioned landfill site. The proposed pre-treatment plant would be sited next to the existing landfill site. The application site lay in the Green Belt but was considered appropriate as it would be well hidden from public view and the visual impact would be minimal.</p>
	<p>Members noted that Point 2 on page 44 of the agenda pack stated that the development would be removed 'as soon as reasonably practicable after the plant is no longer required'. At the request of the Committee, it was agreed that this statement be amended to read 'within six months of the plant no longer being required'. It was agreed that delegated authority be granted to the Head of Planning to reword this.</p>
	<p>The Legal Advisor enquired whether the very exceptional circumstances test had been implemented in respect of this application given that the development would be on Green Belt land. It was confirmed that the test did not apply in this case since the development was not considered to be inappropriate development in the Green Belt.</p>
	<p>Officers raised no further concerns or objections.</p>
	<p>The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously agreed, subject to the agreed rewording of point 2 on page 44 of the agenda pack.</p>

**RESOLVED:**

- 1) That delegated authority be granted to the Head of Planning to reword Point 2 on page 44 of the agenda pack to read 'within six months of the plant no longer being required'; and**
- 2) That the application be approved.**

205. **163 HIGH STREET, YIEWSLEY - 15348/APP/2021/615 (Agenda Item 10)**

**Addition of a storey to provide 5 flats with rooftop amenity space and associated works**

Officers introduced the report noting that a previous application at the site had been refused and dismissed at appeal. Members were informed that the property had prior approval to be converted to residential. A Section 106 agreement would remove future residents' rights to apply for parking permits. The proposed design was deemed to be acceptable and it was thought that the additional storey would not have a major impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties. The application was recommended for approval.

Members raised concerns regarding parking provision as some of the parking in the basement was to be removed and it was noted that parking next door to the site was for the use of ALDI customers only. The Committee was advised that the number of usable parking spaces would not be reduced significantly and the current parking provision was under-utilised. An attempt had been made to address parking issues via the proposed Section 106 which would prevent residents from joining a car parking management scheme. At the request of Members, it was agreed that delegated authority be granted to the Head of Planning to draft an additional condition in relation to barrier treatment to car parking spaces.

The Legal Officer queried the project and monitoring fee being subject to financial obligations despite no financial obligation being sought in the s.106. The Planning Officer suggested that the issue be resolved by Members, as costs would be incurred for supervising the obligation for no parking permits which should be charged by the developer.

Members raised no further comments or concerns. The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously agreed subject to the addition of the agreed condition in relation to barrier treatment of car parking spaces.

**RESOLVED:**

- 1) That the application be approved; and**
- 2) That delegated authority be granted to the Head of Planning to draft an additional condition in relation to barrier treatment to car parking spaces.**

The meeting, which commenced at 4.30 pm, closed at 5.58 pm.

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Liz Penny on Telephone 01895 250185 - [epenny@hillingdon.gov.uk](mailto:epenny@hillingdon.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.