

# Minutes



HILLINGDON  
LONDON

## CENTRAL & SOUTH PLANNING COMMITTEE

4 February 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 Janet Duncan (Opposition Lead)</p> <p><b>LBH Officers Present:</b> Meghji Hirani (Planning Contracts &amp; Planning Information) James Rodger (Head of Planning, Transportation and Regeneration) Alan Tilly (Transport Planning and Development Manager) Glen Egan (Office Managing Partner - Legal Services) Desmond Adumekwe (Enforcement Manager) Steve Clarke (Democratic Services Officer)</p>
159.	<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b> <i>(Agenda Item 1)</i></p> <p>There were no apologies for absence.</p>
160.	<p><b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING</b> <i>(Agenda Item 2)</i></p> <p>Councillor Brightman declared a non-pecuniary interest in item 6 as she had assisted petitioners in preparing their petition. For the duration of the item, Councillor Brightman remained muted and her camera was turned off.</p>
161.	<p><b>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING</b> <i>(Agenda Item 3)</i></p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b> That the minutes of the meeting held on 07 January 2021 be approved as a correct record.</p>
162.	<p><b>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT</b> <i>(Agenda Item 4)</i></p> <p>None.</p>

163.	<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> (Agenda Item 5)</p> <p>It was confirmed that items 1-9 were in Part I and would be considered in public and items 10-15 were in Part II and would be considered in private.</p>
164.	<p><b>1 RAYNTON CLOSE, HAYES - 8096/APP/2020/3154</b> (Agenda Item 6)</p> <p><b>Two storey side extension and single storey side/rear extension.</b></p> <p>For the duration of this item, Councillor Brightman remained muted and her camera was turned off.</p> <p>Officers introduced the application and noted that a previous application for a similar development was refused in February 2020 and an appeal against that decision was subsequently dismissed. Where the previous application had been refused due to the width of the two-storey side extension which exceeded the maximum width stated in the Development Management Policy, the current application had been revised to the extent by which it fully complied with Council requirements and had therefore overcome its previous reason for refusal. The application was recommended for approval.</p> <p>A petition in objection to the application had been received and written representations from the lead petitioner were read out for the consideration of the Committee. Key points raised included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Petitioners stated that the proposed development would negatively impact the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area;</li> <li>• That the plans suggested a possible future House in Multiple Occupation (HMO) as the bedrooms had all been planned with en-suite bathrooms and there was no primary bathroom. Furthermore, the architect had supposedly suggested that the downstairs TV room could be adapted into a bedroom further inferring a potential change of use;</li> <li>• Raynton Close was a cul-de-sac with existing parking stresses, the proposed development would put further strain on parking, particularly at school times;</li> <li>• The proposal, by virtue of its size, scale, bulk, and proximity, would be detrimental to the amenities of Raynton Close by reason of overdominance, overshadowing, visual intrusion, loss of light and loss of outlook.</li> </ul> <p>Members were informed that condition six of the officer's report stated that the development shall not be sub-divided to form additional dwelling units and would therefore not become a HMO without further express permission from the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>The Committee questioned the existing vehicle access to the property and the impact that two dropped kerbs would have on the parking situation in the street. Members noted that in single dwellings, double parking was deemed acceptable and that the owners would be required to apply to the Highway Authority for an additional vehicle crossover. The Committee were informed that the development would have a driveway with enough space to tandem park two vehicles using an existing dropped kerb, a further dropped kerb at the front of the property would not be compliant with Council policies as it would be deemed too close to the junction with Raynton Drive.</p> <p>The materials and aesthetic of the development were raised with regard to ensuring the</p>

property remained in keeping with other developments on the street. Officers informed Members that this property was outside of any conservation area and, as such, the materials required for roof tiles and windows would be at the developer's discretion; however, there was a condition within the report recommending that the materials used match those of existing dwelling.

Members noted that the orientation of the property was such that any issues of overshadowing would fall north which minimised the impact on neighbours. With regard to the garden area, the Committee queried the amount of private amenity space that would remain if the development were to go ahead, officers noted that a previously demolished garage in the back garden had opened up some private amenity space and that together, the front and back garden areas amounted to over 70 square metres which complied with amenity space requirements.

Members noted that the roof of the property had a cranked pitch, yet the plans did not reflect this. Officers noted that an additional condition may be required to show the design of the cranked pitch on a revised elevation plan. The Committee were minded to incorporate this into their decision.

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

**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 the requirement of new plans to show the cranked pitch in the property's roof.**

**165. SPITFIRE HOUSE, CHURCHILL ROAD - 585/APP/2020/3892 (Agenda Item 7)**

**Installation of a rooftop base station to accommodate 6 antenna apertures, 4 600mm dishes, 9 cabinets and associated ancillary development thereto.**

Prior to the commencement of this item, Councillor Brightman returned to the meeting.

Officers introduced the item noting that Spitfire House was part of the recent St Andrew's Park development which was originally the RAF Uxbridge site. Officers informed Members were informed that there had been a substantial response to consultations on the application for the installation of telecommunications equipment on the roof of Spitfire House. The application was deemed by officers to be unacceptable for reasons of its prominent positioning and size, which would increase the buildings height from approximately 14m to just under 20m. Officers also highlighted that a number of listed buildings were situated opposite to the site, increasing its detrimental impact.

A petition in objection to the application had been received and written representations from the lead petitioner were read out for the consideration of the Committee. Key points raised included:

- That the visual impact of the proposals would be intrusive and out of character with the local environs;
- That the immediate area was suburban, and the proposed substation would be seen as incongruously urban for the vicinity;

- The development would be unsightly;
- The proposals did not adhere to article BE1 of Hillingdon's Strategic Plan;
- Residents of the building would be subject to building works, the stress of potential damage to their building and engineers on the roof of the building.

The agent had also submitted written representations which were read out for the consideration of the Committee. Key points raised included:

- The need for this development was due to the necessary removal of an existing telecommunications base station on a rooftop at Brunel University; a replacement mast within a short radius was required to ensure continued coverage;
- The need for digital connectivity infrastructure was of paramount importance as demand had shifted from city centres and places of work to residential and suburban areas;
- The apparatus would have a galvanised-steel finish which would naturally weather and increasingly assimilate to its background setting over time;
- The operators would support customers and residents by ensuring as little disruption as possible;
- The continued and enhanced network services which would be brought forward by the application would greatly outweigh any perceived visual impact that may be caused by the proposed development;
- EE was to become the Emergency Services Network Provider and would dedicate the 4G network for Police, Fire, and Ambulance services.

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

- Concerns were raised as to construction and engineering personnel accessing the site at potentially antisocial hours attending to faults or maintenance needs;
- The use of the RAF Uxbridge site was intended for a prestigious housing development and not for any ancillary facilities;
- The Committee were encouraged to support the officer's recommendation of refusal.

Before the debate, Members attention was drawn to the published addendum.

The Committee highlighted that the chosen site was not an ideal location for this type of development, it was residential on all sides and Members agreed that the proposals were visually intrusive and would increase the buildings height by the equivalent to one storey, this was seen to give the building an unbalanced aesthetic. Members raised concerns regarding whether the "galvanised-steel finish" of the telecommunications equipment would in fact assimilate to its background over time.

The Committee questioned why, seeing as the existing telecommunications equipment at Brunel University needed to be removed and re-sited close by, alternative sites on the Brunel campus had not appeared to be considered by developers.

Members noted the prominent position of the building, adjacent to Hillingdon Road and opposite from a number of listed buildings; the Committee were minded to strengthen refusal reason one to include reference to the visual impact upon the listed buildings opposite. Officers informed the Committee that this would require the inclusion of

reference to policies that come with listed buildings and heritage sites, and as such, the wording of the strengthened refusal reason should be delegated to the Head of Planning; Members agreed to this.

With regard to refusal reason two, Members were minded to expand the reference to the properties opposite Spitfire House on Churchill Road to include numbers 2, 4, 14, 16 and 18, and to also include reference to the properties on Lacey Grove, to the rear of Spitfire House.

The officer's recommendation, with the additions discussed and agreed by Members, was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

**RESOLVED:**

- 1) That the application be refused;**
- 2) That delegated authority be granted to the Head of Planning to expand upon the wording used for refusal reason one to include the listed buildings opposite Spitfire House; and**
- 3) That delegated authority be granted to the Head of Planning to expand upon the wording used for refusal reason two to expand the reference to neighbouring properties on Churchill Road and Lacey Grove.**

**166. 56B WOOD END, GREEN ROAD, HAYES - 54624/APP/2020/4303 (Agenda Item 8)**

**Erection of two rear dormer window and 3 front rooflights following full removal of the existing unlawful dormer window.**

Officers introduced the item and informed the Committee that the application was a revised version of a previous application that had been refused by the Committee in March 2020. An appeal against that decision was dismissed in October 2020. It was also noted that the site was within a conservation area and that the Conservation Officer had objected to the impact that the proposal would have on the conservation area.

Members expressed concerns that there had been minimal improvement from the proposals previously brought before the Committee and noted how the development overlooks and dominates the front view of houses on Albion Road. It was deemed not sufficiently subordinate and not in keeping with the architectural composition of the original dwelling.

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

**RESOLVED: That the application be refused.**

**167. HAYES PARK, HAYES - 12853/APP/2020/2980 (Agenda Item 9)**

**Internal office refurbishment of Hayes Park Central and South including removal of the non-original partitions, re-instatement of the South Building's reflecting pool and refurbished entrances. External elevation and roof refurbishment of both buildings including cleaning and repair works, replacement of non-original glazed double doors and other works to the South building's glazed curtain wall system (Application for Listed Building Consent).**

Officers introduced the application and noted that the two buildings in question were grade II\* listed and important to the heritage of the Borough. It was further noted that, due to current coronavirus restrictions, there were no photographs of the internal elements of the building.

The Committee praised the work of officers with regard to the assessment of the development and were encouraged to see proposals for many of the unique original features to be restored within the buildings.

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

**RESOLVED:** That the application be approved.

168. **ENFORCEMENT REPORT** *(Agenda Item 10)*

**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.

169. **ENFORCEMENT REPORT** *(Agenda Item 11)*

**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

	<p>in disclosing it.</p>
170.	<p><b>ENFORCEMENT REPORT</b> <i>(Agenda Item 12)</i></p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) That the enforcement action, as recommended in the officer's report, was agreed; and,</li> <li>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.</li> </ol> <p>This item is declared as exempt from publication as it involves the disclosure of information in accordance with Section 100(A) and <b>paragraphs 1, 2 &amp; 7</b> of Part 1 of Schedule 12 (A) to the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended), in that the report contains <b>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</b> and that the public interest in withholding the information outweighs the public interest in disclosing it.</p>
171.	<p><b>ENFORCEMENT REPORT</b> <i>(Agenda Item 13)</i></p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) That the enforcement action, as recommended in the officer's report, was agreed; and,</li> <li>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.</li> </ol> <p>This item is declared as exempt from publication as it involves the disclosure of information in accordance with Section 100(A) and <b>paragraphs 1, 2 &amp; 7</b> of Part 1 of Schedule 12 (A) to the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended), in that the report contains <b>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</b> and that the public interest in withholding the information outweighs the public interest in disclosing it.</p>
172.	<p><b>ENFORCEMENT REPORT</b> <i>(Agenda Item 14)</i></p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) That the enforcement action, as recommended in the officer's report, was agreed; and,</li> <li>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</li> </ol>

**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.

173. **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.

The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 8.46 pm.

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Democratic Services on Telephone 01895 250636 - email (recommended) [democratic@hillingdon.gov.uk](mailto:democratic@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.**