Minutes

HILLINGDON PLANNING COMMITTEE

7 May 2025

Meeting held at Committee Room 5 - Civic Centre

	Committee Members Present: Councillors Henry Higgins (Chair), Adam Bennett (Vice-Chair), Keith Burrows, Elizabeth Garelick, Gursharan Mand and Jagjit Singh **LBH Officers Present**: Natalie Fairclough– Legal Advisor Anisha Teji – Democratic Services Ed Laughton – Area Planning Service Manager (C&S) Katie Crosbie – Area Planning Service Manager (North) Mike Kemp – Deputy Team Leader Dr Alan Tilly – Transport & Aviation Team Manager
42.	**APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE** *(Agenda Item 1)* Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Roy Chamdal.
43.	**DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING** *(Agenda Item 2)* Councillor Adam Bennett declared a pecuniary interest in agenda items 8 and 9 as he owned a property on the St Andrews development. He left the room during discussion of agenda items 8 and 9.
44.	**TO RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING** *(Agenda Item 3)* **RESOLVED: That the minutes from the meeting on 9 April 2025 be approved.**
45.	**MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT** *(Agenda Item 4)* None.
46.	**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 would be heard in Part I.
47.	**155 SWAKELEYS ROAD - 20345/APP/2024/3156** *(Agenda Item 6)* **Erection of a part single storey, part two storey rear extension, a first floor side extension, and front porch following demolition of existing porch and conservatory. Conversion of roof space into habitable use to include a rear dormer, 1 rear facing roof light and 1 x front facing roof light. Removal of two existing chimneys. Conversion of garage to habitable use including amendments**

	to fenestration. Officers introduced the application, took Members through the plans and made a recommendation for approval. A petitioner in objection of the application addressed the Committee, noting that the new buyers had introduced themselves and stated that the original proposal had been withdrawn. The petitioner raised objections against the volume and density of the new proposal, stating it did not fit with the environment. They opposed the two-storey rear extension, citing its impact on neighbouring properties, light and view. The petitioner also mentioned that the extension on the garage was not in keeping with the environment. Local Ward Councillors had been contacted and they had emphasised the importance of retaining the character of the area and preventing overdevelopment. It was submitted that these developments were spoiling the area, setting a future precedent and not in keeping with the local area. In response to Member clarification questions, it was noted that the petitioner had not objected to any previous applications. A representative of the application addressed the Committee, noting that the officers' report addressed many concerns raised in the petition. Denying the application would cause inconsistency, as other homes had undergone similar modifications. The home had been designed for a growing family and local amenities and schools made it appealing for family housing. The Committee was asked to support the application, emphasising its respectful enhancement of the existing home and its natural progression and enhancement of the neighbourhood. Officers clarified several points raised in the petition and by the applicant. In terms of the light impact assessment, officers explained that the development cleared the 45° line from neighbouring windows, making it acceptable without needing further sun/day light assessments. It was also noted that planning permission had already been granted for the same development in 2021 and there had been no changes in planning policies or site circumstances since then. Although Members empathised with the concerns raised by the petitioner, it was noted that this application had been approved previously and the Committee had limited options to refuse it. The officers' recommendation was therefore moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, was unanimously agreed. **RESOLVED: That the application be approved as per officer recommendation.**
48.	**90 LONG LANE - 8905/APP/2024/2478** *(Agenda Item 7)* **Demolition of the existing detached, single dwelling and the erection of a building consisting of 4 no. three-bed flats and 5 no. two-bedroom flats, with associated parking and amenities.** Officers introduced the application, took Members through the plans and made a recommendation for refusal. A petitioner objected to the application, citing concerns about privacy, the overwhelming nature of the proposal and its impact on neighbouring properties. The

	petitioner noted that the recent submission was larger than the original and compared it to previous applications. Concerns were raised about the impact on trees, the amount of concrete used and the proposal's inconsistency with the local character of the area. Additional issues included light pollution, noise pollution and the impact on the conservation area. The petitioner mentioned multiple windows and patio doors causing privacy issues, the small size of the property for the number of people and cars and a history of criminal activity impacting peace and quiet for local residents. It was noted that the Chair of the Ickenham Residents Association was unable to attend the meeting, but all the comments submitted in previous letters of objection still stood. The applicant and architect addressed the Committee and issues raised by the petitioner. It was noted that the proposal now included more family units, including four three-bedroom units. The proposal was initially refused due to the perceived impact on the character of the area and conservation area. After discussions with officers, the bulk and massing of the building were reduced by adjusting the depth, width and projection. This resulted in greater spacing to the boundary and improved views beyond the building. The architectural design followed that of number 88 Long Lane, characterised by its projected gable and spanning the width of the plot while being set over three floors. It was submitted that the development was set within a well-landscaped setting, screened by mature vegetation and oak trees, and was considered a significant improvement to the refusal scheme in 2024. It was emphasised that the proposal would complement the plot and wider context of the locality and conservation area. Although concerns had been raised about the impact on neighbouring properties, it was submitted that a sunlight and daylight report demonstrated no loss of light or amenity to neighbouring properties. The primary windows serving habitable rooms faced either forward or rear of the site, with no concerns identified by officers. The proposed development was smaller than the initial scheme and was considered to have no overbearing impact on neighbouring properties. Officers advised the Committee that the tree report was deemed acceptable, with a construction management plan required for protection. Overlooking issues were addressed by recommending obscure glazing for the side windows. The proposal's impact on noise and light pollution was considered typical for residential areas. The retention of category A and B trees at the front was highlighted. Concerns about the scale of the building and its impact on outlook and sense of enclosure were noted. The Committee considered that this was a huge development and accepted the reasons outlined for refusal in the officers' report. The officers' recommendation was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, was unanimously agreed. **RESOLVED: That the application be refused as per officer recommendation.**
49.	**ST ANDREWS PARK - 585/APP/2024/1879** *(Agenda Item 8)* **Hybrid planning application comprising: Outline planning permission (with all matters reserved) for residential development and commercial uses, to be occupied flexibly within Use Classes E(a), E(b), E(c), E(e), E(g)(i), E(g)(ii) and a convenience store (Use Class E(a)); plus car parking, hard and soft landscaping, and all other associated works; Plus, full planning permission for reinstatement of gym use (Use Class E(d)) and change of use to provide a cafe (Use Class E(b)) within the former cinema building; and external alterations; and associated car**

	parking, hard and soft landscaping and all other associated works. Officers introduced the application and took Members through the plans and addendum. A recommendation for approval, section 106 and Stage 2 Mayor of London referral was made. The Committee considered these applications together however voted on each item separately. The Committee welcomed the completion of the site and considered the officers' reports to be thorough. The officers' recommendation, was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, was unanimously agreed. **RESOLVED: That the application, section 106 and Stage 2 Mayor of London referral be approved as per officer recommendation.**
50.	**FORMER CINEMA BUILDING, ST ANDREWS PARK - 85/APP/2024/1799** *(Agenda Item 9)* **Application for Listed Building Consent for internal and external alterations to former cinema building, to enable reinstatement of gym use (Use Class E(d)) and change of use to provide a cafe (Use Class E(b)).** Officers introduced the application and took Members through the plans and addendum. A recommendation for approval was made. The Committee considered these applications together however voted on each item separately. The Committee welcomed the completion of the site and considered the officers' reports to be thorough. The importance of protecting and restoring the cinema to a good quality standard before it deteriorated further was emphasised. The officers' recommendation, was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, was unanimously agreed. **RESOLVED: That the application be approved as per officer recommendation.**
	The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 8.00 pm.

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Anisha Teji on 01895 277655 or ateji@hillingdon.gov.uk. Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.