

Minutes

HILLINGDON PLANNING COMMITTEE

9 April 2025



HILLINGDON
LONDON

Meeting held at Committee Room 5 - Civic Centre

| | |
|-----|--|
| | <p>Committee Members Present: Councillors Adam Bennett (Vice-Chair, in the Chair) Keith Burrows Roy Chamdal Elizabeth Garellick Jagjit Singh Darran Davies Raju Sansarpuri</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: Ed Laughton – Area Planning Service Manager Katie Crosbie – Area Planning Service Manager Alan Corcoran – Deputy Team Leader Chris Brady – Planning Team Leader Richard Michalski – Highways Engineer Natalie Fairclough – Legal Advisor Liz Penny – Democratic Services Officer</p> |
| 32. | <p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE <i>(Agenda Item 1)</i></p> <p>Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Henry Higgins with Councillor Darran Davies substituting and from Councillor Gursharan Mand with Councillor Raju Sansarpuri substituting.</p> |
| 33. | <p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING <i>(Agenda Item 2)</i></p> <p>Councillor Darran Davies declared a non-pecuniary interest in agenda item 6 as he had been in discussion with petitioners on the matter. He left the room and did not participate in the discussion or voting on this item.</p> <p>Ward Councillor Jan Sweeting declared a non-pecuniary interest in agenda items 7 and 8 as she lived in the road in question.</p> |
| 34. | <p>TO RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING <i>(Agenda Item 3)</i></p> <p>RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting dated 12 March 2025 be agreed as an accurate record.</p> |
| 35. | <p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT <i>(Agenda Item 4)</i></p> <p>None.</p> |

**TO CONFIRM THAT THE ITEMS OF BUSINESS MARKED PART I WILL BE
CONSIDERED IN PUBLIC AND THE ITEMS MARKED PART II WILL BE
CONSIDERED IN PRIVATE (Agenda Item 5)**

It was confirmed that all items on business were marked Part I and would be considered in public.

37. 18 & 20 WILMAR CLOSE, HAYES - 67410/APP/2024/2641 (Agenda Item 6)

Change of use of 2no. outbuildings to granny annexes.

Officers introduced the application which was recommended for approval. Members were informed that there was potential for an appeal on this application hence the Council needed to demonstrate that it had learnt from previous appeal decisions.

A petition in objection to the application had been received. The lead petitioner was in attendance to address the Committee Members. Key points highlighted included:

- The original report contained an incorrect front view of the property.
- The correct view was provided, showing the left-hand side of the property.
- The view included numbers 20, 18, and 16 to the right, and numbers 19 and 21 to the left.
- The property owners had dug up the front shared drive for one week, which had then remained for seven months.
- They illegally tapped into the mains water pipe, causing brown water issues.
- Affinity Water had had to fix the pipe on several occasions.
- The owners damaged fences and exposed neighbouring properties.
- The property was used as an unlicensed HMO with up to 10 people living in it.
- The house was covered in mould, posing a risk to a newborn child.
- Water and electric pipes were fed through a trench around the back, causing the fencing to fall down.
- The owners claimed the outbuildings were for their parents, but residents feared they would be rented out.
- The Council had rejected the planning permission for the outbuildings.
- The residents were concerned about the impact on the street scene and community.
- There were issues with litter and fly-tipping in the area.
- The safety of children and neighbouring properties was compromised.

Members noted that only material considerations could be taken into account.

The agent for the application was also in attendance and addressed the Committee Members. Key points highlighted included:

- The agent advocated for the approval of the planning application for the proposed use of the outbuildings as residential annexes for the applicant's elderly parents.
- The proposal aimed to provide a safe, comfortable, and accessible living environment for the applicant's parents, allowing them to maintain their independence while being close to their family.
- The proposed development was intended to have a minimal impact on the surrounding area, as the outbuildings were already in place and their conversion to residential use would not alter the character or appearance of the area.

- There was no significant increase in traffic or demand on local services expected, as the annexes were intended for family use only.
- The proposal aligned with the National Planning Policy Framework, which emphasised the importance of providing a range of housing options to meet the diverse needs of the population, including the elderly and those with disabilities.
- The proposed development complied with local planning policies that encouraged the use of existing buildings for residential purposes.
- Concerns raised by neighbours were noted, but they were not considered relevant or significant enough to warrant refusal of the application.
- Planning permission would be required to change the use of the annexes to self-contained dwellings, and this issue was addressed in the proposed conditions.
- Several recent appeal decisions had allowed similar developments within Hillingdon.
- The existing dwellings were let to families, but section 21 eviction notices had been served, with the intention for the applicant and their brother to move into the properties as soon as the current tenants moved out.
- The Committee was requested to approve the application for the use of the outbuildings as residential annexes.

Members sought clarity from the agent on a number of points.

They asked if there had been any previous applications approved by the inspectorate of the same size. In response the agent explained that the principal deciding factor in these appeals was the amount of garden space available, and in this case, there was a very large garden.

Councillors also enquired about the two separate buildings and their intended use. It was confirmed that the buildings were for the applicant's parents to live close to but separate from the main households.

The Committee suggested that it would be better to have an extension on the existing buildings instead of separate annexes. The agent agreed that traditionally, granny annexes were attached to the main dwelling but noted that separate structures had been used successfully by other families.

Members questioned the security and accessibility of the annexes for elderly people. In reply, the agent acknowledged that the current residential environment was not ideal but stated that improvements could be made if the application was approved.

In response to further questions from the Committee regarding who was currently living in the main properties, the agent confirmed that the properties were let to separate families, but the intention was for the applicant and their brother to move in once the current tenants moved out.

Councillors also queried the need for the annexes if the elderly parents were not currently living there. It was explained that the long-term plan was to use the properties as suggested, and the idea to use the annexes as residential spaces had developed more recently.

It was noted that Ward Councillor Darran Davies had submitted a written representation in objection to the application, but it was not possible to read this out on this occasion as Councillor Davies was substituting for Councillor Higgins on the Committee.

Officers noted the importance of focussing on material matters. It was clear that the property was currently rented, and evidence of a section 21 notice had been provided. The scale of the outbuildings was approximately 40 square metres, and it was noted that an appeal regarding a nearby property had been allowed at 37.8 square metres. It was confirmed that the internal floor area at the development included a kitchen, bedroom, and toilet, but Members were reminded that the plans for the annex did not depict a cooking area.

It was highlighted that the Council had rejected similar applications before, but the appeals had subsequently been successful; officers had a legal obligation to learn from the inspector's measures through appeals. It was noted that officers had obtained statutory declarations and section 21 notices to secure the best possible scenario for the petitioners and residents. The point about HMO was different from the previous application on Fraser Avenue, and the petitioner could raise a petition if concerned about the potential for outbuildings to be used in conjunction with an HMO. A landscaping condition was suggested to provide level access between the main dwelling and the annex suitable for use by elderly people.

Given that the proposal related to two different properties, Members suggested that there should be some clear demarcation within the outbuildings to reflect this.

Councillors asked for clarification about the statutory declarations, questioning whether they were offered independently by the applicants or suggested by the planning team. Officers explained that the declarations were not a requirement for the application but were obtained to ensure the applicant went above and beyond the conditions secured in previous appeals.

Members enquired if there was a kitchen in the outbuildings, as it was not shown on the plans. It was clarified that the annex allowed for separate living accommodation, but the kitchen reference was from a different appeal decision.

A question was raised regarding two separate letters from a GP about parents with special needs being accommodated in the outbuilding. Officers confirmed that the existing property had a ground floor kitchen, and the GP's report was based on medical need rather than the layout shown on the plan.

Councillors expressed doubts about the intentions of the applicant, noting that the applicant's family members were not living in the property. Officers reiterated that the application was for ancillary living accommodation and that conditions were in place to control its use.

There was a request to add a condition to ensure that only immediate family would be allowed to live in the outbuilding.

To clarify matters, Members recommended a site visit to enable them to fully evaluate what was proposed.

Deferral for a site visit was proposed, seconded and, when put to a vote, agreed with 5 Councillors voting in favour and one against.

RESOLVED: That a decision on the application be deferred for a Member site visit to consider the proposal.

| | |
|-----|---|
| 38. | <p>44 FRAYS AVENUE, WEST DRAYTON - 35220/APP/2024/3046 (Agenda Item 7)</p> <p>Demolition and reconstruction of new build family home.</p> <p>Officers introduced the application and highlighted the additional information set out in the addendum. It was noted that the application was recommended for approval.</p> <p>A petition had been received in objection to the application. The lead petitioner was in attendance and addressed the Committee Members on behalf of petitioners. Key points highlighted included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The lead petitioner had lived on Fraser Ave, Australia for 55 years. • He represented 32 residents who had signed a petition against the demolition of a two-storey house and the construction of a three-storey house. • The proposed development would negatively impact the Area of Special Local Character and street scene. • The development would result in a three-storey house next to a bungalow, which was not in keeping with the area's character. • The area predominantly consisted of bungalows and two-storey houses with one-metre spaces between boundaries. • There was a concern that new large houses may later be converted into houses of multiple occupation. • Petitioners urged the Council to reject the application for 44 Fraser Ave to preserve the area's special character. • If the application could not be refused, he requested that the decision be deferred, and the site visited to enable Members to see for themselves the area's special character. <p>In response to Members' questions, the lead petitioner confirmed that rooflights were being tiled over at some houses along Frays Avenue.</p> <p>The applicant / agent were not in attendance.</p> <p>Ward Councillor Jan Sweeting addressed the Committee Members in support of petitioners. Key points highlighted included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Councillor Sweeting noted a non-pecuniary interest in the agenda item and spoke against the planning application. • The proposed development was different from any other property in the Garden City and would deliver a building out of character in terms of excessive bulk, scale, and design. • The officer's report showed the height of the proposed building matching others, but none had the huge side dormer mentioned in paragraph 7.141. • The proposed building created a large living space on the 3rd floor, contrary to the area's special local character, which only allowed single or two-story buildings. • Approval of the planning application had the potential to set a precedent for other two-story properties in the area to be extended upwards using side dormers. • Paragraph 7.9 stated that there was a proposed gap between numbers 44 and the neighbouring 46 of some 1.5 meters, this did not accord with the drawings which showed a gap of less than one metre. • The existing attractive 3-bedroom family home of 172 square meters was to be |
|-----|---|

replaced by the proposed building of 316 square meters, an increase of 84%.

- The Committee was requested to refuse the unacceptable planning application.

In response to questions from the Committee, the Ward Councillor acknowledged that the area had changed significantly over the last 20 or 30 years. However, it was noted that the local Residents' Association supported the continuation of the Area of Special Local Character. It was reported that, in recent years, there had been a dramatic increase in the numbers of houses converting loft areas into a 3rd storey; this did not accord with the character of the local area which predominantly comprised one and two storey buildings. The Ward Councillor observed that the plans were unclear, and it was not possible to ascertain the number of bedrooms proposed or what the additional floor area would be used for.

Officers addressed some of the concerns that had been raised. It was clarified that the property was actually not a three-storey dwelling but a two-storey dwelling. The height of the development was similar to the two properties next door and to an existing property further along the street.

It was noted that a dormer could legitimately be constructed to the side of the property and did not constitute a robust reason for refusal. Permitted development rights were restricted in areas with heritage assets or conservation areas, but this area was not a heritage asset and PD rights had not been removed. Members heard that the property was not operating as an HMO and the proposed development added one additional bedroom to the existing three-bedroom property. The Committee was informed that the scale, bulk, and mass of the dwelling were comparable to existing properties in the street. Officers noted that the planning inspector had been on site next door and had overturned the Council's decision to impose a condition on the development. The development was considered acceptable as it did not impact the character of the street scene and the scale of the building was not considered excessive from a planning perspective.

Members enquired whether it would be possible to add a condition to protect residents and ensure the property was not converted to an HMO in the future. In response, officers confirmed that the proposed design would not be suitable for use as a small HMO and the imposition of a condition could be deemed to be unreasonable. Any further changes to the proposed, such as conversion to two flats, would require additional planning permission. The Legal Advisor stated that the imposition of an HMO condition would have to pass all six parts of the required test; to deviate from this would run the risk of an appeal.

In response to further questions from Councillors it was confirmed that the proposed parking arrangements were deemed to be adequate.

The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, agreed with four Councillors voting in favour, one against and two abstentions.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved in accordance with the officer recommendation and subject to the amendments to Condition 4 and the inclusion of a new Condition as detailed in the Addendum Report.

| | |
|-----|---|
| 39. | <p>10 FRAYS AVENUE, WEST DRAYTON - 5235/APP/2025/188 (Agenda Item 8)</p> <p>Erection of a single storey rear extension, amendments to side extension roof, extension to existing loft conversion including extension of roof to the rear and formation of crown roof, enlargement of rear dormer window, and installation of 2no. side facing roof lights, and addition of render and insulation to external walls.</p> <p>Officers introduced the application which was recommended for approval.</p> <p>A petition in objection to the application had been received and the lead petitioner was in attendance to address the Committee Members. Key points highlighted included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The officer had misunderstood the main reason for the petition, which related to the construction on the boundary wall. • The petition included 25 signatures. • The petition aimed to address the construction on the boundary wall, not a massive two or three-storey planning request. • The area of special local character (ASLC) leaflet stated that any redevelopment or two-storey side extension should be at least one metre from the side boundary. • The distance between the boundary wall and the neighbouring property was 900 millimetres at its widest point. • The space became narrower further down due to a chimney. • The owners of the property intended to use the structure for a piano tuition room for commercial purposes. • The nearby window was his daughter's bedroom / study room. • The speaker expressed concerns about noise from the piano tuition room affecting their work. • The existing side extension was a temporary lean-to structure with a perspex plastic roof. • The structure was initially a post and plastic roof at ground level, later infilled with single skin brickwork. • The plans were incorrect, showing a nine-inch solid wall instead of a 4 1/2 inch garden wall. • The speaker did not oppose the rest of the development, as it did not include a three-storey or six-bedroom house. • It was noted that there were two side roof velux windows. <p>The applicant / agent was not in attendance.</p> <p>Ward Councillor Jan Sweeting addressed the Committee Members in support of petitioners. Key points highlighted included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Councillor Sweeting noted a non-pecuniary interest in the agenda item and spoke against the planning application. • No.10 Frays Avenue was unlike most properties in the area of special local character. • The proposed 4-bedroom property would have been squeezed into a small plot and negatively affected the neighbouring property at number 81. • The shared boundary required a party wall agreement, and the front dormer and crown roof were the basis of the objection from the Council's conservation officer. |
|-----|---|

- The proposal did not meet the requirement of being at least one metre from the side boundary to retain the spacious setting.
- The extension was to be built on the site of the old lean-to, which was allowed due to the 10-year rule.
- The proposed front builder extension and crown roofs were not common features on the estate and were contrary to policy.
- The report mentioned properties numbers 14 and 3 Frays Avenue, which had shared boundaries, but their boundary walls were garage walls, not walls to habitable spaces.
- Allowing the habitable room on the boundary would set an unfortunate precedent not in keeping with the area's requirements for spacious settings.
- Paragraph 7.13 mentioned that a slight increase in the site size would not harm the neighbour's amenities, but resolving the party wall issue might require the roof to be heightened.
- The site was small and cramped, and only with unusual features could a 4-bedroom house be built.
- The property was listed as a six-person HMO and had previously generated considerable issues of concern.
- The Garden City was a unique area, and the Committee was asked to refuse the application as it negatively affected the immediate neighbour and did not protect the area's integrity.

Officers addressed Members to clarify some of the issues raised by petitioners and the Ward Councillors.

With regard to the 10-year rule, it was noted that the report referred to the structure being in place for 10 years, but the lawful basis for the extension was actually four years. Officers mentioned that the general feature of crown roofs was not uncommon in the area. The extension to the rear was a modest 0.3-metre extension and did not need to be set in from the boundary. It was noted that the policy requiring buildings to be set off the boundary was to protect against the terracing effect, which was more relevant to two-storey dwellings. Officers acknowledged the petitioner's concern about noise from the potential use of the structure for piano lessons but noted that the new structure needed to conform to building regulation standards, which would improve insulation. The existing structure was built up to the boundary, and the extension to the rear was very modest. Officers recommended approval of the proposed small-scale development.

Members enquired whether the proposed conditions could be strengthened to protect the lead petitioner from noise emanating from the music room. In response, officers observed that the plans did not mention a music room specifically. Should the room be used for a larger scale commercial operation, this would be a matter for planning enforcement.

In response to further questions from the Committee, it was noted that 6-person HMOs did not require planning permission. The property had previously been used as an HMO but the current applicant could not be held accountable for previous use. Officers observed that the 1-metre rule existed primarily to prevent a terracing effect; at single storey level it was felt that the gap would still be visible.

In response to Members' requests for clarification, the Legal Advisor noted that party walls were a property matter and did not fall within the remit of planning legislation.

No further concerns were raised by the Committee. The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, agreed with six votes in favour and one abstention.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved in accordance with the officer recommendation.

148 – 154 HIGH STREET, UXBRIDGE - 78696/APP/2024/867 (Agenda Item 9)

Demolition of existing buildings and construction of a mixed-use development comprising a hotel (Use Class C1), residential co-living accommodation (Class Sui Generis), and commercial floorspace (Use Class E) and ancillary work, including public realm improvements, a new pocket park, basement parking, and associated infrastructure.

Officers introduced the application and highlighted the information in the addendum. It was noted that the application was recommended for approval.

Councillors sought clarification about the term "Co living" and its implications. It was explained that it was a recognised accommodation type, purpose-built for rented accommodation, with smaller units than traditional studio apartments.

In response to further questions from Members about the number of Co living units, it was confirmed 320 units were proposed.

Concerns were raised regarding the adequacy of nine parking spaces for potentially over 400 people. Officers explained that the proposal included a small retail element and promoted a car-free development, with parking spaces reserved for disabled residents.

Councillors raised questions about the impact on surrounding areas due to the parking-free scheme and the reduction of retail space. It was clarified that the design of the units aimed to attract longer-term tenants and improve vitality in the town centre.

The Committee questioned the allocation of a sizable contribution to Transport for London and its specific use. It was confirmed that the money would be spent on addressing and improving challenges within the bus garage.

Councillors requested further information on the fire brigade's standard guidance notice and the environmental impact of the development, specifically the absence of solar panels. Officers explained that the internal specialists had raised no objections and conditions were secured to ensure appropriate measures.

Concerns were expressed in relation to the demolition and transportation logistics of the site. It was confirmed that conditions were in place to manage the construction logistics and minimise impact on surrounding businesses and residents.

Councillors supported the development but emphasised the importance of managing transportation schemes effectively. Officers assured that the logistics would be managed appropriately.

Members expressed support for the development, highlighting its benefits.

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

RESOLVED: That the application be approved in accordance with the officer's recommendation and subject to the following:

- **Amendments to Conditions 5 and 7 as detailed in the Addendum Report.**
- **Amendment to Condition 2 to include two drawings omitted as advised in the officer's verbal update.**
- **Stage 2 referral to the Mayor of London**
- **Completion of s106 agreement.**

41. 2ND/ 9TH RUISLIP SCOUT GROUP, 18 ST CATHERINES ROAD, RUISLIP - 6039/APP/2024/3226 (Agenda Item 10)

Variation of Condition 2 (Accordance with Approved Plans), Conditions 3 (Tree Protection) and 5 (Landscaping) of planning permission ref. 6039/APP/2021/3465 dated 03-03-2022 (Removal of derelict scout hut and storage unit to facilitate the erection of a replacement single storey scout hut building)

The minor material amendments include:

- **Changes to accessibility (with external ramp and disabled parking), hard and soft landscaping and external fittings.**
- **Minor change to the building overall positioning on the site.**
- **Fenestration changes on front elevation plan with repositioning of fire exit door.**

Officers introduced the application which was recommended for approval.

Ward Councillor Peter Smallwood had submitted a written representation in support of the application which was read out for the consideration of the Committee Members. Key points highlighted included:

- Councillor Smallwood registered his interests as a member of the Executive Committee of the 1st/3rd Ruislip Scout Group.
- The application was strongly supported as it provided a new home for the 2nd/9th Ruislip Scout Group.
- The Group's previous base had been redeveloped into three family homes on Ladygate Lane, making the new facility essential for continuing high-quality scouting.
- The proposed building was thoughtfully designed, modest in scale, and sensitive to the surrounding area, including key accessibility features.
- The planning amendments were modest and appropriate, with no adverse impact on the surrounding residential character or neighbouring amenity.
- The accessibility improvements significantly enhanced the inclusivity of the facility and aligned with local and national planning policies.
- Scouting provided young people with invaluable opportunities to develop confidence and skills.
- The new hut ensured the 2nd/9th Ruislip Scout Group had a permanent and suitable base to thrive in the future.

Members were in support of the proposal and raised no objections. The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously approved.

| | |
|--|--|
| | RESOLVED: That the application be approved in accordance with the officer recommendation. |
| | The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 9.45 pm. |

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Democratic Services - Email: democratic@hillingdon.gov.uk on . Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.