

## Minutes

### BOROUGH PLANNING COMMITTEE

11 January 2022

Meeting held at Committee Room 5 - Civic Centre,  
High Street, Uxbridge



HILLINGDON  
LONDON

	<p><b>Committee Members Present:</b> Councillors Henry Higgins (Chairman) Steve Tuckwell (Vice-Chairman) Jazz Dhillon Allan Kauffman John Morse (Opposition Lead)</p> <p><b>LBH Officers Present:</b> Nesha Burnham, Principal Planning Officer Katie Crosbie, Planning Team Leader Roz Johnson, Planning Services Manager Kerrie Munro, Legal Advisor Liz Penny, Democratic Services Officer Alan Tilly, Transport Planning and Development Manager</p>
18.	<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Nicola Brightman, Councillor Ahmad-Wallana and Councillor Mohinder Birah with Councillor Jazz Dhillon substituting for the latter.</p>
19.	<p><b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING</b> (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>Councillor Steve Tuckwell declared a non-pecuniary interest in agenda item 8 (32 Norwich Road, Northwood – 35516/APP/2021/2969) as he had close relatives living close to the application site. He did not vote and left the room during discussion of the item.</p>
20.	<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 dated 7 December 2021 be agreed as an accurate record.</p>
21.	<p><b>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>Liz Penny, Democratic Services Officer, tabled a report entitled Temporary Covid-19 Protocol for Written Representations: Standardisation of Time Limits. It was confirmed that the Committee was requested to consider the standardisation of time limits for submission of additional information and written representations to no less than 48 hours prior to a meeting – consistent with the rules for those that attended to speak in</p>

person. Members were also requested to note the addition of legal services advice regarding privacy and a tidy up of the protocol by Democratic Services which did not alter any material aspect of it.

The proposal was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously agreed (Councillor Dhillon was absent therefore did not vote on this item).

**RESOLVED: That the proposal be approved as per the officer's recommendation.**

22. **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 were in Part I and would be considered in public.

23. **49 BEECH AVENUE, RUISLIP - 12926/APP/2021/3897** (*Agenda Item 6*)

**Replacement of existing property with a 2.5 storey building comprising 4 x self-contained flats, parking, landscaping works and widening of vehicular crossovers to front.**

Officers introduced the application and made a recommendation for refusal. It was noted that the agent had submitted a revised ground floor plan 24 hours in advance of the meeting. The Council was not obliged to consider this revised drawing at this late stage but had opted to do so since it was likely, if the application were to be refused and an appeal lodged, that the drawing would be submitted at that time; it was therefore deemed sensible to have regard to it within the meeting. Members were informed that the agent had attempted to overcome the reasons for refusal by omitting the footpath in the revised plan. However, officers felt this had not addressed overlooking concerns satisfactorily as cars would still be parked in close proximity to ground floor habitable windows. Moreover, the revised plan created an additional issue for residents on the upper floor as access to their rear garden would be impractical. It was noted that the Chairman had decided to allow the revised plan to be considered on this occasion since it did not change the building itself – only the outer area.

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

- Beech Avenue was currently a quiet friendly street. The petition had been signed by 63 local residents who vehemently objected to the proposed development. Many of these residents had lived on the street for many years;
- The proposed flats were not in keeping with properties in the immediate vicinity which were family homes. There was a worrying trend whereby bungalows were being knocked down to be replaced with huge developments, thus ruining the street scene;
- The development would result in an unacceptably high density of people for the building. This would lead to an increase in noise and waste pollution and would create additional parking stress. The proposed car park would also lead to a significant increase in air and noise pollution to surrounding properties;
- The proposed development would be 2.5 storeys high, hence would result in a loss of privacy to surrounding properties.

A written representation (accompanied by an updated ground floor plan) was read out to the Committee on behalf of the agent. In response to proposed reason for refusal 1,

Members heard that, as set out in the proposed revised plan, at the front of the windows to the bedroom of Flat 1 and the living room of Flat 2, a buffer at least 1.5 metres wide with 1.2 metre high hedges or similar and with a flower bed and shrubs would be created to ensure an adequate visual and physical barrier. This buffer would prohibit future residents from passing in front of these habitable windows thus safeguarding the privacy of the ground floor flats. Additionally, car parking bays P1 and P2 would be allocated to Flats 1 and 2 respectively thereby further reducing the chance of overlooking or loss of privacy. Moreover, soundproof triple glazed windows would be installed to the habitable rooms at the front at ground floor level.

Ward Councillor Heena Makwana was in attendance and spoke in objection to the application noting that policy DMH2 of the Hillingdon Local Plan set out a requirement for a mix of housing units. The current need in the Borough was for family sized units; however, the application in question failed to propose any such units. Moreover, the application proposed two side windows which would be likely to result in a loss of privacy to no. 47. Additionally, the footpath and car parking spaces outside flats 1 and 2 would result in a lack of privacy and noise disturbance to said flats. No lift was proposed at the site therefore accessibility to the first-floor flats for wheelchair users would be limited. Finally, Ward Councillors were concerned that the proposed disabled parking bay had not been reflected in the drawings.

Members observed that the proposed development was excessively bulky and incongruous. In response to the Committee's request for the addition of another reason for refusal in relation to the loss of a family home it was confirmed that it would be difficult to raise new material concerns at this stage given the planning history at the site and the recent appeal.

Members requested further clarification regarding access. It was confirmed that the newly proposed omission of the footpath would result in a somewhat contrived access to rear garden. This additional concern could be incorporated in the refusal reasons.

The Committee enquired whether the hedge had been conditioned and whether the amenity space was deemed to be sufficiently private. It was confirmed that officers were satisfied with the privacy to the rear of the application site but were not convinced by the proposed green strip to the front.

The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote unanimously agreed. Councillor Jazz Dhillon was absent for part of the discussion, therefore did not vote on this item.

**RESOLVED:**

- 1. That delegated authority be granted to the Planning Service Manager to amend the reasons for refusal to reflect the changes in the revised ground floor plan including concerns regarding upper floor resident access to the rear garden; and**
- 2. That the application be refused.**

24. **302 KINGSHILL AVENUE, HAYES - 29352/APP/2021/3740** (*Agenda Item 7*)

**Erection of singly-storey front and rear gazebo canopy structures with operable shutters, open sides with metal mesh material and gazebo metal columns and part covered sides (timber cladding) to rear gazebo structure to facilitate the use**

**of part of the premises as a shisha lounge together with demolition of existing single storey store/office area to rear of premises.**

Officers introduced the application and made a recommendation for refusal.

A written representation from petitioners was read out to the Committee in objection to the application. Key points highlighted included:

- An online e-petition had been supported by a large number of local residents who objected to the opening of a shisha lounge in a residential area;
- Residents were concerned that, were it to go ahead, the proposal would result in unpleasant smells, loud noise late at night, an increase in parking stress, crime and antisocial behaviour. Moreover, it was felt the proposal would have an adverse impact on the character of area;
- Other shisha lounges already existed in the area therefore a new one was unnecessary;
- Residents were content with their area which was bustling during the day and settled at night.

The agent for the application was in attendance and addressed the Committee in support of the proposal. Key points highlighted included:

- Concerns regarding parking stress had been addressed in the officer's report;
- It was confirmed that the restaurant was well-established, well-managed and had no track record of antisocial behaviour under the current management – there was nothing to suggest that this would change in the future; however were the restaurant not well-managed, the matter would come to the attention of the police and the local Council which would put the current restaurant in jeopardy;
- A number of other restaurants along the parade were open at night therefore the area was not currently silent at night-time as had been suggested;
- There were a lot of misconceptions regarding shisha lounges which were simply places where people could meet to socialise, smoke, chat and consume alcoholic and non-alcoholic drinks. The Hillingdon Plan highlighted the need to develop drivers of the economy that fostered social inclusion;
- If the application were approved, odour and acoustic reports would be obtained and implemented prior to the structure being constructed. Moreover, it was confirmed that only one of the structures (to the front) would proceed;

In response to questions from the Committee, the agent observed that local businesses should be encouraged to rebuild post lockdown. It was reported that the proposed small extended section would have little aesthetic or obstructive impact.

Ward Councillor Darran Davies addressed the Committee in objection to the proposal highlighting concerns regarding the impact of increased parking stress on a busy shopping parade; it was felt said parking stress could result in a loss of revenue to the local shops. Concerns were also raised regarding the proposed rear smoking area which would impact on residents in Kingshill Avenue and Adelphi Crescent – it was further believed that the rear entrance would encourage antisocial behaviour. Gates had been installed by shop owners to the rear to discourage antisocial behaviour which had been a problem in the past - if left open later at night, it was feared the undesirables would return. It was also noted that other businesses in the vicinity closed at 11:00/11.30 with the exception of the Brookshouse Pub which employed SIA security staff.

Members were reminded that they could only consider the application before them irrespective of any newly suggested amendments to it.

The Committee observed that, whilst sympathising with the challenges faced by the proprietor post-pandemic, the proposal was not appropriate for the location. It was noted that shisha lounges were difficult to police in terms of noise and odour; in this case the proposal would inevitably cause a disturbance to residents both above and behind the application site. Furthermore, Members had concerns regarding the proposed rear entrance.

Members noted that the first reason for refusal mentioned noise, disturbance and odour in addition to refuse and recycling arrangements. At the request of the Committee, it was agreed that refuse and recycling arrangements would form the basis of a separate reason for refusal for the purposes of clarity.

Members did not feel the proposal was appropriate. The officer's recommendation was therefore moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

**RESOLVED:**

- 1. That delegated authority be granted to the Planning Services Manager to amend reason for refusal 1 as agreed by the Committee; and**
- 2. That the application be refused.**

25. **32 NORWICH ROAD, NORTHWOOD - 35516/APP/2021/2969** (*Agenda Item 8*)

**Demolition of existing detached property and construction of new part two storey, part three storey building comprising 8 flats with associated vehicular crossovers, car parking and amenity space.**

Councillor Steve Tuckwell had expressed an interest in agenda item 8 therefore left the room and did not take part in the discussion or voting on this item.

Officers introduced the application and made a recommendation for refusal. Eight reasons for refusal were cited.

A petitioner was in attendance and addressed the Committee in objection to the proposal. It was felt that the officer's report was thorough and covered all the salient points. The proposal was deemed to be a crude attempt to cram as many units as possible onto a plot with no consideration given to neighbours. It was reported that the parking allocation was misleading as only 2 of the proposed 6 spaces would be usable without driving across the bus stop. It was noted that a previous application for the site had proposed a 4 flatted development in the style of a semi-detached home which would have been far preferable. It was suggested that any future development on the site should take the form of a semi-detached or detached family home given the need for family accommodation in the Borough.

The agent for the application was in attendance and addressed the Committee in support of the proposal. He commented that he felt that the proposed reasons for refusal had not been fully justified in the report. Key points highlighted included:

- Setting - the proposal was for an L-shaped development along Norwich Road and Cranbourne Road. This was a common layout for a corner plot which created a sense of enclosure and provided privacy;

- Scale and bulk - the report did not consider that the proposal constituted overdevelopment. The proposed development would have no adverse impact on neighbouring properties;
- Height – the proposal did not exceed the height of existing buildings nearby;
- Design – National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), section 12, paragraph 134 encouraged innovative designs and use of balconies - buildings in the vicinity were 1930s houses with no architectural merit therefore something new was to be welcomed. Balconies would provide amenity space for the occupants and would enable them to enjoy the fresh air;
- The tree referred to was not a mature silver birch tree. The International Union for the Conservation of Nature considered the silver birch to be the least important to include on the red list;
- A mix of units including 3-bedroom flats could easily be incorporated into the scheme and ground floor flats could be made accessible to disabled people.

Councillor Duncan Flynn was in attendance and addressed the Committee on behalf of petitioners in objection to the application. Councillor Flynn commented that the proposal in question was one of the worst he had ever seen in all his time as Ward Councillor. The fact that there were eight refusal reasons in the officer's report spoke for itself. Councillor Flynn commented that the height, bulk and mass of the proposed development constituted overdevelopment and the design was not in keeping with the local area. The proposed siting of a vehicle crossover next to a bus stop was very concerning, particularly given the proximity of a school and nursery. There was a failure to provide family-sized accommodation and the proposed flats did not meet the required minimum housing standards. Additionally, the parking situation would be undesirable and did not meet the Council's standards.

Members commented that they liked the innovative design in principle but found it to be wholly inappropriate in the proposed location. The development was far too big and was not at all in keeping with the local area. Moreover, it did not offer the kind of accommodation that Hillingdon Council wanted its residents to live in. On these grounds Members were minded to refuse the application.

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

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

26. **199 FIELD END ROAD, EASTCOTE - 2698/APP/2021/2355** (*Agenda Item 9*)

**Change of use from a financial and professional services, retail and café (Use Class E) to a mixed-use comprising retail, restaurant and cafe and a drinking establishment (Sui Generis) and retention of awnings and air conditioning units.**

Officers presented the report and highlighted the information in the addendum. The application was recommended for approval.

A written submission was read out on behalf of Ward Councillors objecting to the proposal. Key points highlighted included:

- Policy DMTC4 placed the onus on the applicant to demonstrate that there would be no adverse impact on or loss of amenity to nearby properties;
- The Planning Committee had not been provided with a noise impact assessment to enable it to assess this information;

- The absence of detail regarding the kitchen layout and ventilation rendered an informed decision impossible;
- The absence of a service plan made impact on highways impossible to determine;
- It was unclear whether the fire exit precluded one of the car parking spaces from being used – the site plan suggested that safe exit may be hindered by the bicycle store and stairs from flats above.

Noting the Planning History at the site, Members enquired how the current application differed from previous ones. It was confirmed that, in the latest application, the rear entrance would no longer be used to access the drinking establishment in the basement. The previous application had also sought longer operating hours; these had been reduced in the current application which proposed a closing time of 12pm.

Members observed that kitchen equipment would be contained in the basement and enquired whether a fire safety condition should therefore be applicable to ensure the safety of the establishment and of neighbours. It was confirmed that there was no requirement for fire safety information to be included in the application; however, at the request of the Committee, it was agreed that a fire safety condition would be added which would come into effect on commencement of the restaurant operation.

With regards to noise concerns, Members heard that a noise impact assessment would be submitted prior to the commencement of the new operation at the premises.

Members raised no further objections or requests for clarification. The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously agreed. Councillor Alan Kauffman did not vote on this application as he had been absent during part of the presentation of the item.

**RESOLVED: That the application be approved subject to the addition of a fire safety condition to come into effect on commencement of the restaurant operation.**

27. **BARRA HALL, HAYES (APPLICATION FOR LISTED BUILDING CONSENT) - 8134/APP/2021/2148** (*Agenda Item 10*)

**Barra Hall CCTV upgrade and new CCTV column addition (application for listed building consent).**

Officers introduced the application and recommended that it be approved.

The Committee raised no objections. The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

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

28. **BARRA HALL, HAYES (APPLICATION FOR FULL PLANNING PERMISSION) - 8134/APP/2021/2147** (*Agenda Item 11*)

**Barra Hall CCTV upgrade and new CCTV column addition (application for full planning permission).**

Officers introduced the application with a recommendation for approval.

	<p>The Committee raised no objections or concerns. The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED: That the application be approved.</b></p>
29.	<p><b>RAVENCOURT CLOSE, RUISLIP - TREE PRESERVATION ORDER - NO. 792</b> <i>(Agenda Item 12)</i></p> <p><b>Tree Preservation Order No. 792 (TPO 792) Group 1: All Oaks within Ravenscourt Close, Ruislip.</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the application with a recommendation for approval.</p> <p>The Committee noted that the oak trees contributed to the amenity of the area and had a long life expectancy. Members raised no objections or concerns. The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED: That TPO 792 be confirmed.</b></p>
	<p>The meeting, which commenced at 6.03 pm, closed at 7.45 pm.</p>

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