

## Minutes

### MINOR APPLICATIONS PLANNING COMMITTEE

13 July 2021

Meeting held at Council Chamber - Civic Centre,  
High Street, Uxbridge



HILLINGDON  
LONDON

	<p><b>Committee Members Present:</b> Councillors Henry Higgins (Chairman) John Morgan (Vice-Chairman) John Morse (Opposition Lead) Shehryar Ahmad-Wallana Mohinder Birah Nicola Brightman David Yarrow</p> <p><b>LBH Officers Present:</b> James Rodger, Deputy Director of Planning and Regeneration Meghji Hirani, Planning Contracts and Planning Information Manager Alan Tilly, Transport and Aviation Team Manager Kerrie Munro, Planning Lawyer Steve Clarke, Democratic Services Officer</p> <p><b>Also Present:</b> Councillor Raymond Graham</p>
17.	<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies had been received from Councillor Allan Kauffman with Councillor David Yarrow substituting.</p>
18.	<p><b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING</b> (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>No interests were declared by the Members present.</p>
19.	<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 22 June 2021 be approved as a correct record.</p>
20.	<p><b>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
21.	<p><b>TO CONFIRM THAT THE ITEMS OF BUSINESS MARKED PART 1 WILL BE CONSIDERED IN PUBLIC AND THAT THE ITEMS MARKED PART 2 WILL BE CONSIDERED IN</b></p>

**PRIVATE** (*Agenda Item 5*)

It was confirmed that all items were in Part 1 and would be considered in public.

22. **LAND ADJACENT TO 5 ALBERT ROAD, NORTH HYDE ROAD, ALBERT ROAD - 42985/APP/2021/1990** (*Agenda Item 6*)

**Erection of part two storey and part three storey residential building to provide 6 flats with associated landscaping, refuse and cycle storage.**

Officers introduced the report noting that a previous application on this site had been refused in December 2019 and subsequently dismissed on appeal. The application in front of Members was an amended revision of the previous application however officers still considered the proposals to be detrimental to the visual amenity of the area and provide limited amenity space for prospective occupiers. The application was recommended for refusal.

A petitioner objecting to the application was present and addressed the Committee. A number of points were raised, including:

- There was no off site parking provision shown on the plans; this was deemed to lead to an increase in parking stresses on the adjacent roads and potentially make emergency vehicle access more difficult.
- The proposed property would not be in keeping with other buildings in the vicinity, being significantly higher than other buildings.
- The proposals would not safeguard existing trees on the site which will hinder the landscape of the local area.
- The proposed building would protrude too close to North Hyde Road, potentially increasing danger to pedestrians next to the busy road.
- The development would lead to a loss of privacy and light for occupiers at number 5 Albert Road.
- The development would be detrimental to adjacent properties by virtue of overdominance, overshadowing and visual intrusion.

Members concurred with the petitioner that this was an overdevelopment of the site and the development was deemed unreasonable in such a prominent position. The officer's recommendation for refusal was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

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

23. **LAND FORMING PART OF 43 THE DRIVE, ADJACENT TO 68 AND 119 KNOLL CRESCENT - 70975/APP/2021/1458** (*Agenda Item 7*)

**Erection of two semi-detached houses with associated parking.**

Officers introduced the item noting that related planning permission had previously been refused in September 2019, however this was subsequently allowed at appeal in February 2021. The application in front of Members was a variation of the permission

granted at appeal; the revisions were not deemed to be significant enough to warrant reason for refusal. The application was recommended for approval.

A petition objecting to the development had been received. The lead petitioner's nominated individual was present and addressed the Committee with their concerns, key points included:

- Petitioners were appreciative that the Council had opposed the previous application and were disappointed when it was subsequently allowed at appeal.
- The current proposals differed from those allowed at appeal in that they were larger, being 3-bedroom dwellings rather than 2-bedroom dwellings. This was deemed to lead to a bulkier development with additional overlooking of adjacent occupiers.
- Concerns were raised around the excavation of land to move the houses further forward; excess water was already onsite and flowing into an adjacent stream. Further concerns were raised around drain capacity to support the additional houses. Petitioners believed that sustainable drainage systems should not just be a condition but part of the application itself.
- Concerns were raised as to the impact the additional occupiers will have on parking pressures in Knoll Crescent making emergency vehicle access more difficult.
- Petitioners questioned whether the Planning Inspectorate would have granted permission should they have known that the application would have been amended to include two additional bedrooms.
- Concerns were raised around the protected trees on site; petitioners requested that the tree condition be amended to include a substantial fine should the TPO protected trees be damaged. Further concerns were that if the trees became damaged, they would be replaced with inferior trees.

The Deputy Director of Planning and Regeneration responded on the drainage matter noting that condition 15 could be strengthened to apply prior to the commencement of said works rather than at the point they reach super structure works. Members echoed concerns of the petitioners that this was a surface run-off area into a stream which fed into Ruislip Lido; Members highlighted the need to prevent potentially polluted water from running into that stream and concurred with officers that condition 15 should be strengthened.

Attention was drawn to the additional bedrooms within the revised proposals; officers highlighted that they could be seen positively as they allow for the dwellings to be family units. It was also noted that the Council's tree officer was satisfied with the conditions protecting the trees on site which came under a TPO.

The officer's recommendation, including the agreed strengthening of wording in condition 15, was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

**RESOLVED:**

- 1) That the application be approved;**

**2) That the Head of Planning be delegated authority to strengthen the wording of condition 15 relating to drainage.**

24. **ST JOHNS SCHOOL - 10795/APP/2021/1036** (*Agenda Item 8*)

**Subdivision of gatehouse to form two 1-bedroom maisonettes.**

Officers introduced the report noting that the building formed part of the school and is therefore unusual for a residential dwelling; officers determined that this was used as part of the school and therefore fell within use class F rather than use class C3. Officers highlighted condition 7 which set out that the units created should be used solely in connection with, and ancillary to, the wide school use of the site.

A petition objecting to the development had been received and the lead petitioner had submitted a written statement that was read out for the Committee ahead of the debate. Key points raised in the statement included:

- Concerns were raised that the development would provide sub-standard accommodation for occupiers and it was noted that the flats created would be smaller than the government recommended size for flats.
- The changes brought about by the development would degrade the features of what is a locally listed building.
- The Gatehill Farm Estate had been designated an area of special local character and previous applications for conversions of properties into flats had been refused on the grounds that the Estate maintains a policy of single family per plot occupancy. It was highlighted that the application was not in keeping with this.
- Concerns were raised as to the appropriate address for the residence as it was listed on Potter Street Hill however access was gained from Wieland Road.
- Further concerns were raised as to a separate planning application from the school relating to alterations to parking arrangements on the school site; this was seen as closely related to the current application and therefore deemed a piecemeal application.

The applicant was in attendance and addressed the Committee. Key points raised included:

- With this application the school was investing significant funds in refurbishing a locally listed building.
- The conversion of the property into flats allowed the school to recruit and retain members of staff, particularly young members of staff who may encounter difficulties when accessing the local housing market due to cost.
- The proposed additional condition to restrict use of the development to be ancillary to the school was understood and accepted. This had already been the case for a number of years, and it was emphasised that the property was not for commercial letting.
- Plans were amended following concerns from the conservation officer to ensure

that the only visible change to the building was the new entrance door within the arch, this would match the existing door.

- The applicant also confirmed that there was currently no one living in the property.

Officers addressed the petitioner's concerns that this would be substandard accommodation; it was highlighted that both of the proposed 1-bedroom flats would be above 50 square metres and would comply fully with national standards. What wouldn't comply with standards was that the property overall was under 120 square metres, it was highlighted that this was a local policy and the reasons why the application was recommended for approval were set out in the report. On the issue of the separate planning application made by the school, this was deemed to have no bearing on the application in front of Members.

Clarifications were made that, although the application was unorthodox, it was seen as a one-off development and would therefore be a one-off decision to sub-divide a property in the Gatehill Farm Estate. To ensure that no future applications for sub-divisions in the area could reference this application, it was suggested that an informative be added to clarify this. Further to this, it was noted that the informative wouldn't preclude the attached 3-bedroom property, also within school grounds, from applying for a similar form of development in the future.

The officer's recommendation, including the additional informative agreed by the Committee, was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

**RESOLVED:**

- 1) That the application be approved;**
- 2) That the Head of Planning be delegated authority to word an additional informative notifying that this is a once-only manner of development for the Gatehill Farm Estate.**

25. **56 SWAN ROAD, WEST DRAYTON - 76289/APP/2021/1143** (*Agenda Item 9*)

**Single storey rear extension.**

Officers introduced the report noting that the proposals were fully compliant with Council policies and it was deemed that there was limited impact on adjoining occupiers. It was noted that concerns had been raised regarding use of the property as an HMO, attention was drawn to the addendum and it was highlighted that the Council's Licensing team had been made aware of this in April 2020 and were to investigate the matter; the property was not listed as a licensed HMO, however officer's had included a condition within the recommendations to ensure that the property could not be used as an HMO in future without further express permission from the Local Planning Authority. It was also noted that the property was currently undergoing work to its roof in the form of a hip to gable conversion and a loft extension, this was allowed under permitted development. The application was recommended for approval.

A petition objecting to the development had been received. The lead petitioner was present and addressed the Committee, key points raised included:

- Concerns had been raised that the property was currently in use as an

unlicensed HMO. Whilst noting that the use of the property was currently listed as a family home, the petitioner welcomed the condition that, should the item be approved, the property would be prevented from becoming an HMO.

- Concerns were raised as to the extent to which the proposed extension would restrict the amount of light entering the adjoining property and lead to a loss of outlook and amenity. The petitioner made reference to the Council's 45-degree policy.
- It was suggested that a site visit take place for Members to see the impact that the new loft extension would have in conjunction with the proposed development, as the images shown in the officers presentation had not featured the loft extension, construction of which had only recently finished.

Ward Councillor for West Drayton, Councillor Jan Sweeting, had submitted a written statement that was read out in support of the petitioners. Key points included:

- It was highlighted that one of the plans was showing a side elevation with a 6-metre extension, this was concerning as the proposals were for a 3.6 metre extension.
- It would assist the Committee's decision if they also had plans of the adjoining 54 Swan Road as these would show how the proposed extension would impact on the property.
- Further concerns were raised as to the use of the property as an HMO; it was highlighted that the Covid-19 pandemic had hindered officers ability to properly investigate the property during 2020. The applicant had stated the property was a family home, when it was felt it was likely being used as an unlicensed HMO.

Officers highlighted that, should the application not be approved, then the property could be used as an HMO for up to 6 people; if it were approved in accordance with the officer's recommendations, condition 6 would dictate that the property could not be used as an HMO. Officers also clarified that the proposed dimensions of the extension were compliant with Council policies, including the 45-degree policy which only applied to 2-storey extensions. Regarding the claim from Councillor Sweeting that a 6-metre extension was shown in certain plans, it was clarified that they referred to the original proposals, not the proposed development Members were currently considering.

Although the Committee were supportive of the condition to prevent the property from becoming an HMO, Members were minded to carry out a site visit to fully establish the impact on the adjoining occupier at 54 Swan Road. It was proposed that the item be deferred to allow for a site visit, this was seconded, and when put to a vote agreed.

**RESOLVED: That the application be deferred to allow for a site visit.**

26.	<p><b>PINNER SERVICE STATION, HIGH ROAD - 3689/APP/2021/1392</b> (<i>Agenda Item 10</i>)</p> <p><b>Installation of one Jet Wash to include concrete base and drainage, solid and glazed 2.7m high side screens and fixed electrical jet wash cabinet.</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the report highlighting that the site was within a conservation area and the conservation officer had deemed the proposals to have an unacceptable impact on the conservation area. The application was recommended for refusal.</p>
-----	---

A petition objecting to the development had been received. The lead petitioner's nominated individual was present and addressed the Committee with their concerns, key points included:

- It was noted that local residents used the service station and believed it to be an asset to the community, however, there were concerns that the proposals would lead to increased nuisance for residents living in the vicinity.
- The service station previously had a jet wash resulting in numerous complaints from residents relating to the audio alarm that would alert users of the jet wash to the time they had left, the alarm was at a volume high enough to disrupt neighbouring residents. The Service station lowered the volume of the alarm however, each time the jet wash was serviced, the alarm would revert to its original volume and the process would repeat. Noise levels were a significant concern for residents within Flag Walk.
- The proposals did nothing to align themselves with the conservation area that the site was within.

Members were in agreement with officer's concerns that the proposals would have a detrimental impact on the conservation area. Further concerns were raised around increasing use of the service station potentially leading to an increase in road traffic accidents due to the busy highway. The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

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

27. **170 HAREFIELD ROAD - 23469/APP/2020/3612** (*Agenda Item 11*)

**Erection of a 3-bed detached bungalow with habitable roofspace involving parking and amenity space.**

The Chairman briefly introduced the item noting that determination of the application had been deferred from the previous meeting to allow for a site visit. It was also noted that the petitioners and agent had used their speaking rights at the previous meeting however, as a Ward Councillor for Uxbridge North, Councillor Raymond Graham would have the opportunity to address the committee.

Officers drew Members attention to the suggested conditions proposed in the addendum following the site visit; namely that the access road to the site be widened and that the applicant demonstrate that an internet delivery van could turn at the site even when both car parking spaces were occupied to ensure it leaves in a forward gear rather than reversing down the access road.

Ward Councillor for Uxbridge North, Councillor Raymond Graham, was present and addressed the Committee. Key points raised included:

- Overdevelopment of garden areas was discouraged in favour of brownfield sites. The proposals were deemed to be in breach of Hillingdon Local Plan Policy DMH6, in so far as, there was a loss of garden area to the detriment of local amenity space, character and biodiversity.
- Residents at 168, 170, 170a and 172 Harefield Road would lose significant

levels of privacy and light coverage due to the size and height of the proposals.

- Regarding the site access road, it was highlighted to be too narrow and noted that 170a had right of way over the final section of the driveway and could not be impeded at any time. Specific concerns were raised over the requirement for emergency vehicle access to 170a at all times. A request was made for a fresh London Fire Brigade consultation.

Officers highlighted that the principle of development could not be opposed as it was in an area of the Borough with high levels of backland development. On the matter of the access road, it was noted that London Fire Brigade had been consulted with due to the concerns of residents, it was specifically highlighted that they had not objected to the proposals.

Officers emphasised the importance of the two additional recommended conditions highlighted in the addendum. It was also noted that the applicant had confirmed through plans that the construction compound would not be on the driveway and would therefore not impede emergency vehicle access during construction, this was also enforced through the officer's recommended condition 10 relating to the Construction Management Plan. Officers suggested that, should the Committee be minded to approve the application, the original plan be used rather than the revised plan as one of the petitioners' complaints was that they had not been consulted with on the revised plan.

Members discussed the importance of the site visit in giving them clarity on matters around the access road and were supportive of the suggested additional conditions in the addendum which made clear the applicant's obligations. The officer's recommendation, including the suggested conditions in the addendum and the advice to use the original Construction Management Plan, was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, agreed by five votes for and one vote against.

**RESOLVED:**

- 1) That the application be approved; and,
- 2) That the original Construction Management Plan submitted with the application be used rather than the revised plan.

28. **1-6 STATION PARADE, ICKENHAM ROAD - 75568/APP/2021/1151** (*Agenda Item 12*)

**Redevelopment of the site including the demolition of existing buildings and erection of a 3-storey building to provide 2 retail units on the ground floor and 8 residential units (Class C3 use) on the upper floors, with associated car parking, refuse storage, cycle storage and private amenities areas.**

Officers introduced the report noting that, after revisions to the original plans had been made, officers deemed the application to be acceptable in terms of its impact on the street scene, impact on adjoining occupiers and the facilities that it provided. The recommendation was for approval.

Members were supportive of the plans and sought clarification on what amenity space would be available for the eight residential units. Officers confirmed that in residential units above retail space, ground floor amenity space was not required however,

balconies were proposed to provide amenity space. The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

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

The meeting, which commenced at 6.00 pm, closed at 7.57 pm.

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Steve Clarke on 01895 250693. Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.