

## Minutes

### BOROUGH PLANNING COMMITTEE

9 March 2023

Meeting held at Council Chamber - Civic Centre,  
High Street, Uxbridge UB8 1UW



HILLINGDON  
LONDON

	<p><b>Committee Members Present:</b> Councillors Henry Higgins (Chairman) Steve Tuckwell (Vice-Chairman) Philip Corthorne Ekta Gohil Gursharan Mand Raju Sansarpuri Jagjit Singh</p> <p><b>LBH Officers Present:</b> Michael Briginshaw, Principal Planning Officer Nesha Burnham, Principal Planning Officer Katie Crosbie, Planning Team Leader Glen Egan, Legal Advisor Roz Johnson, Planning Services Manager Noel Kelly, Interim Head of Development Management Liz Penny, Democratic Services Officer Fiona Rae, Planning Team Leader Sophie Wilmot, Transport Strategist</p> <p><b>Also Present:</b> Ward Councillor Tony Burles</p>
101.	<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies were received from Councillor Farhad Choubedar with Councillor Philip Corthorne substituting.</p>
102.	<p><b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING</b> (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>There were no declarations of interest.</p>
103.	<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 14 February 2023 be agreed as an accurate record.</p>
104.	<p><b>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>

105.	<p><b>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</b> (<i>Agenda Item 5</i>)</p> <p>It was confirmed that all items of business were marked Part I and would be considered in public.</p>
106.	<p><b>NORTHWOOD POLICE STATION, 2 MURRAY ROAD, NORTHWOOD - 46639/APP/2022/60</b> (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p><b>Change of use from former Police Station (sui generis) to mixed use place of worship (Class F.1) and community centre (Class F.2), along with minor alterations to car park layout.</b></p> <p>Officers presented the application and highlighted the information in the addendum. It was noted that the application sought the change of use of a Grade II listed building situated in a Conservation Area. The schedule of existing and proposed activities, together with the likely busiest periods and the estimated numbers of cars which would use the site were highlighted to Members. It was noted that the building had a physical capacity of 292 people and a sanitary capacity of approximately 200. It was anticipated that 100 people would be on site at the busiest times.</p> <p>Officers had raised concerns in relation to parking stress, traffic, the lack of sustainable transport and air quality hence the application was recommended for refusal on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Unacceptable impact on highways safety;</li> <li>2. Unacceptable impact on air quality; and</li> <li>3. Failure to secure mitigation through a S106 legal agreement by virtue of recommendation for refusal.</li> </ol> <p>A petition in objection to the scheme had been received and the lead petitioner addressed the Committee. Key points raised included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Petitioners' objections were based purely on the grounds of traffic congestion, noise and air pollution;</li> <li>• Volume of traffic in Northwood was already an issue and the proposed change of use would have a major impact on traffic congestion, safety and the health of all Northwood residents;</li> <li>• The Iron Aid Foundation (IAF) had stated that the premises would be in use from dawn until almost midnight. 100+ attendees were expected to attend some events including Friday prayers and festivals. Seven rooms would be available for rental for other activities;</li> <li>• The Iron Aid Foundation claimed that up to 50 staff had previously worked at the police station. In reality, only 6 members of staff had worked out of Northwood Police Station at one time;</li> <li>• Northwood Police Station had never been a 24 hour Police facility hence a Police telephone box had been placed outside with an out of hours connection to Uxbridge Police Station;</li> <li>• Drop off and pick up at the premises would result in major congestion in a restricted parking zone;</li> <li>• It was likely that drop off / pick up drivers would come into conflict with shoppers using the Waitrose car park opposite the entrance to the Police Station car park;</li> </ul>

- Crossing the busy junction would be dangerous;
- The IAF had been worshipping at St John's Church in Hallowell Road for over 10 years without any impact on the community but the proposed site was within the central conservation area;
- If granted, the proposal would lead to an increase in air pollution;
- Northwood town centre was at saturation point with heavy traffic and was about to get worse due to the large number of apartment blocks planned / being built.

The applicant and agent for the application were in attendance and addressed the Committee. Key points highlighted included:

- The IAF was an existing organisation which had been operating in Northwood for 12 years close to the proposed site with no complaints raised;
- There were insufficient faith and community facilities available in the Borough at present;
- The proposed location was a vacant listed building which needed to be renovated and brought back into use;
- The proposal would resolve a number of existing issues – the current operation at St John's Church had no parking provision whereas there would be 15 spaces at the Police Station. There were no planning restrictions at the Church whereas restrictions were proposed at the Police Station. Moreover, the proposal obligated travel planning and parking management;
- External consultants had raised no significant concerns;
- The policy threshold for refusal on traffic grounds was **severe cumulative impact** – this was not mentioned in the report;
- The IAF would agree to pay the air quality mitigation contribution if the application were approved;
- The maximum capacity had been calculated by officers as a theoretical exercise based on building regulations;
- If there was to be a population explosion in Northwood, good community facilities would be needed to support it;
- The IAF had been founded in 2010 and aimed to help the Community;
- Prayer was important but represented a small part of the planned centre activities;
- The Foundation had a proven track record of helping those in need e.g. raising significant funds for the Paul Strickland Scanner appeal. £250k had also been raised locally in the last five years for good causes and they were currently planning to join forces with the 'Live at Home' charity;
- The IAF had developed a good relationship with St John's Church based on trust and had received no complaints;
- The IAF had engaged positively with the Council and the community and planned activities would not overlap peak traffic times of school drop off and pick up;
- The proposals had cross-faith support.

The Planning Service Manager addressed Members in relation to some of the points raised. It was confirmed that officers were not recommending a refusal reason in respect of noise following advice received from the Council's noise officer and from an external consultant.

The new site would allow an increase in use and the existing site currently being used would still be available.

For the purpose of clarification, Members' attention was drawn to paragraph 111 of the National Planning Policy Framework which stated that "Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe". It was confirmed that officers had concerns that there would be an unacceptable impact on highways safety.

In response to questions from the Committee, the lead petitioner confirmed that Maxwell Road was extremely congested at all times- even at night.

Members sought clarification from the agent regarding projected numbers of attendees. It was confirmed that these had been calculated based on current numbers and those expected to attend future events. It was estimated that approximately 100 people would attend Friday prayers- attendees at other events would be far fewer.

In response to their questions regarding parking and congestion, Members heard from the agent that this would be carefully managed. Eventbrite would be used as a booking system for the car parking spaces. Those intending to visit the premises would be able to see whether a space was available in the car park and, if not, could make alternative arrangements. There would be car parking spaces for those with disabilities. With regard to drop offs and pick-ups, it was confirmed that many of the proposed events would take place in the evenings when it was quieter. Although there were parking restrictions in the area, a quick drop off or pick-up was permitted. In terms of 'hard measures' to address parking issues, it was anticipated that people would not try to access the car park once it was full. With regard to the 30% car share mode, it was confirmed that this was a voluntary arrangement – a high degree of car sharing (2.7 people per car on average) was anticipated especially for evening prayers.

Further to questions from Committee Members, it was claimed that the number of HGVs likely to use the Waitrose store opposite the application site was insignificant hence there would be little opportunity for conflict.

Councillors sought clarification regarding the air quality concerns and the applicant's failure to secure mitigation through a S106 legal agreement in relation to this. Members were informed that air quality had been reviewed by the Council's air quality specialists who felt the proposed change of use would result in harm due to net additional trips. The development was not deemed to be air quality neutral, and the measures proposed were not sufficient to mitigate the total emissions. The applicant had claimed that the change of use would not result in additional trips therefore had not agreed to contribute towards air quality mitigation measures.

In respect of highways concerns, Members heard that parents dropping their children off for activities would often be obliged to get out their cars and cross a busy road – this was a safety concern. It was anticipated that visitors to the premises would try and park as near as possible rather than using local car parks. It was likely that some 50 or 60 cars would visit in a day with car parking spaces for only 14 cars. Moreover, the busy junction and HGV movements opposite were a matter of concern.

In response to further requests for clarification, Members heard that much of the information provided to officers had related to Friday prayers and there had been a gap in the information relating to the proposed community use of the premises especially between the hours of 6-7pm. There could be up to 90 people on site at that time and this had not been fully assessed as part of the application. Estimated numbers of attendees were not necessarily an indication of future usage and it was felt that the

worst-case scenario had not been adequately assessed by the applicant.

Members expressed their concerns regarding parking, vehicle movements and attendees and noted the strength of the comments from Highways officers.

Noise and disturbance were also a matter of concern. It was confirmed that third party advice had been taken in relation to this and, if approved, mitigation measures were proposed such as closure of the parking at certain times, prohibiting external public address and a Facility Use Operations Manual. It was felt that an acceptable noise environment could be achieved therefore noise was not recommended as a reason for approval. It was confirmed that concerns regarding the access gate were covered in Highways reason for refusal.

In summary Members were in favour of bringing the Police Station back into use and commented that a place of worship would be welcomed. However, it was felt that this was the wrong location given the concerns regarding the highways implications on a busy junction, with a supermarket opposite and a school nearby. Air quality was also a matter of considerable concern.

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

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

107. **NORTHWOOD POLICE STATION, 2 MURRAY ROAD, NORTHWOOD - 46639/APP/2022/56** (*Agenda Item 7*)

**Internal alterations and repairs including relevant works. Reinstatement and repair works to windows, doors, police lamp and call box (application for listed building consent)**

Officers presented the application which was recommended for refusal. It was noted that the application site was Grade II Listed and formed part of the Green Lane Conservation Area.

A petition had been received in support of the application. The lead petitioner and the agent addressed the Committee. Key points raised included:

- The interior of the building was in an extremely poor condition.
- The application for Listed Building Consent only related to the minimal internal alterations needed in relation to the change of use.
- The applicant intended to fully refurbish the building.
- Less than substantial harm had been identified by officers.
- Officers were satisfied that sufficient public benefits outweighed the harm.
- It was only because of the earlier refusal that this application was also being refused.
- The applicant was aware that taking on a listed building was not for the faint-hearted.
- Pre-application advice had been taken and the proposals had been amended accordingly - the congregation would be split into smaller units and events staggered. Internal alterations had been minimised and no external alterations were proposed.
- Under the proposal the lamp and call box would be re-installed.

Members noted that the application was linked to the previous one which had been refused. The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

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

108. **TORMEAD, 27 DENE ROAD, NORTHWOOD - 9043/APP/2022/2490** (*Agenda Item 8*)

**Demolition of existing buildings and replacement with up to 2.5 Storey extension to main building to provide 4 self-contained flats and redevelopment of existing coach house building to provide 1 maisonette unit with associated parking, cycle and bin storage, and landscape works.**

Officers introduced the application and highlighted the additional information set out in the addendum. It was considered that the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the area and would not unduly impact the living conditions of neighbouring properties. The proposal would provide 16 car parking spaces, seven of which would be allocated to the existing flats at the site. The application was recommended for approval.

A petition had been submitted in objection to the application. The Lead Petitioner was in attendance and addressed the Committee highlighting the following points:

- The application site was located in an Area of Special Local Character (ASLC). The Heritage report described the special local characteristics of Dene Road ASLC as comprising detached houses set back from the road with large gardens, a verdant appearance and mature trees in profusion. This ASLC was about the front gardens – shrubs, trees and green features of quality.
- The front garden of Tormead currently had trees in abundance. The application plan sought to cut down the hedge, fell 13 trees at the front and turn the current small car park into a 16-space car park.
- The building site next door to Tormead was an ecological disaster zone. Residents did not want to see the same happen at Tormead.
- The Council's policies set out the need to conserve ASLCs and protect biodiversity to support changes to adapt to climate change and encourage the development of wildlife corridors. Dene Road was already such a wildlife corridor and needed protection.
- A suggested solution was to install the new parking spaces in the basement. The current front garden could then be retained.

The agent was in attendance and addressed the Committee. Key points highlighted included:

- The proposal sought to deliver 4 3-bed units and a 2-bed flat – a net gain of 4 homes.
- The proposal had been developed in consultation with planning officers and a Conservation Officer. It had taken account of officer's feedback and had resulted in a heritage-led sympathetically designed scheme with no loss of good quality trees. Verdancy would be very much maintained.

- The proposal would make better use of an underutilised site and would make a positive contribution to meet the Borough's housing needs.
- It would not impact adversely on neighbouring amenity and would offer high quality accommodation, an abundance of attractive amenity space and sufficient on-site parking.
- The extension's footprint would be comparable to the current and represented a modest and subservient addition to Tornead. Space standards would be exceeded.
- The proposal would sustain the current listing status.
- Planning conditions would be accepted including obscure windows to account for neighbouring amenity.

In response to Members' questions, the agent confirmed that verdancy would be maintained as per the proposed landscaping plans. There would be a loss of 19 trees, but these would be replaced by 4 new trees and additional verdancy.

Members welcomed the proposed much needed family dwellings but expressed concern regarding the impact on the ASLC noting that the development would constitute a dramatic change to Dene Road. It was confirmed that, during the pre-application stage, extensive negotiations had taken place to achieve the current scheme which was considered acceptable. The current coach house would be retained, and the proposed extension would be set behind it hence the main building would remain the key feature and the extension would be subordinate to it. Under the current scheme, the dormers had also been reduced and the proposed glazed link would further protect the current street scene.

In terms of car parking, Members heard that there were currently 8 spaces and the area was tarmacked. The proposal would be to extend this area to accommodate 16 car parking spaces. Soft landscaping would protect verdancy. There would also be replacement trees to the front and to the side and the number could potentially be increased so as to further maintain verdancy.

Councillors noted that the proposed car parking area would be semi-exposed whilst the current one was well-screened. It was vital that the verdancy of Dene Road be protected by way of conditions.

In response to their requests for further clarification, Members were informed that the species of replacement trees could be conditioned, and the Council's Tree and Landscape Officer would advise on this. There would be controls in place to ensure replacement trees were of high quality. It was felt that the proposed scheme would appropriately protect the ASLC and the locally listed building which were non-designated heritage assets – Members were referred to the policies set out on page 153 of the agenda pack (DMHB 3 and NPPF paragraph 2.03).

Members sought reassurance regarding access for emergency vehicles, the amenity of the basement flats and the location of the cycle parking provision. It was confirmed that the ground level lowered at the site thereby ensuring that the occupiers of the basement level flats received adequate light and outlook. The location of the cycle store was pointed out to Members, and it was confirmed that there was sufficient space in the car park area for emergency vehicles to gain access.

At the request of the Committee, it was agreed that the landscaping condition be amended to ensure the 19 current trees be replaced with 19 trees to be planted within Northwood. The landscaping condition would be submitted to the planning authority in

consultation with the Chairman. In terms of surfacing for the car park, Members requested that permeable materials be used. It was agreed that delegated authority be granted to the Planning Service Manager, in consultation with the Chairman, to reword conditions appropriately.

The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously agreed subject to the rewording of the conditions relating to landscaping and materials as discussed.

**RESOLVED:**

- 1. That delegated authority be granted to the Planning Service Manager, in consultation with the Chairman, to tweak the conditions in relation to landscaping to ensure verdancy and the condition regarding materials to ensure permeability; and**
- 2. That the application be approved.**

109. **170 HAREFIELD ROAD, UXBRIDGE - 23469/APP/2022/3593** (*Agenda Item 9*)

**Erection of new 3-bedroom bungalow with dormers and roof lights serving accommodation in the roof on land to the front of existing dwelling; garden and bike stores in garden.**

Officers introduced the application which was recommended for refusal. The application followed a previous application which had been refused and dismissed at appeal. The current application was recommended for refusal as it was felt it would form an uncharacteristic, cramped and incongruous form of development which would obscure the host dwelling, reduce openness and fail to harmonise with the character of the area and the street scene. It was also felt that the proposal would give rise to harmful overlooking and loss of privacy between the proposed dwelling and numbers 170 and 172 Harefield Road.

A petition in objection to the development had been received. The lead petitioner addressed the Committee highlighting the following key points:

- Residents were concerned that the properties would effectively disappear from the street scene due to the gradient of the road.
- Nos. 217 and 215 across the road had been offset to ensure they did not look at each other and it was important they did not lose their outlook.
- Numbers 172, 170a and 170b shared the driveway and in excess of 7 vehicles a day could use it. This raised a concern in terms of road safety as there was a blind bend when exiting.
- The proposal would constitute an overdevelopment of the site and the current infrastructure was inadequate.

The agent for the application addressed the Committee and highlighted the following points:

- The applicant had amended the scheme in accordance with the inspector's comments.
- The inspector had been satisfied that the siting of the dwelling would not be uncharacteristic, and the sub-division of the site would not be harmful to the appearance of the area.
- The inspector had concluded that limited separation to side and rear boundaries

would cause the dwelling to appear cramped but the harm arising from the obscuring of 170 and 172 Harefield Road would be modest. Harm to the area would also be modest.

- To address the inspector's concerns, the proposal had been reduced in width, depth and height. Separation distances had been increased and the roof height reduced by 1m. The building footprint had been reduced by 14% and the internal floor area would be 26% less than the previous scheme.
- The new proposal would be more in keeping with the street scene.
- The lounge doors would be set 21.4m away from the front of the attached garage to no.170.
- Planting would minimise overlooking. The garden to the proposed dwelling had been increased in size and now provided 43 square metres more than the Hillingdon standard.
- There was now adequate space to the front of numbers 170 and 172 to provide additional planting if required.
- The site had been separated from no. 170 and did not form part of the front garden therefore should be considered as undeveloped land.
- All concerns of the inspector had been addressed. If refused, the applicant would consider appealing the decision.

Ward Councillor Tony Burles was in attendance and spoke in support of petitioners stating that the proposal was effectively to build a large unit in a front garden. This would be detrimental to the amenity of numbers 170 and 172 and constituted an unacceptable level of overdevelopment.

In response to questions from the Committee, Members were informed that the distance between properties had been scaled at 18m. It was confirmed that previous reasons for refusal relating to transport and highways and access had been dismissed by the inspector. The 2 remaining reasons for refusal as set out in the report related to overdevelopment and overlooking.

Members expressed considerable concern regarding the uncharacteristic nature of the proposal. The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

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

110. **FORMER GARAGES SITE REAR OF SULLIVAN CRESCENT, HAREFIELD - 60653/APP/2022/531** (*Agenda Item 10*)

**Erection of no.4 x two storey terraced houses and no.2 x two storey semi-detached houses, with associated car parking and landscaping works.**

Officers introduced the application which was recommended for approval. The application was a re-submission following the lapse of the previously granted planning permission. It was noted that the garden sizes for plots 4 and 5 fell short of private amenity standards; however, this was deemed to be acceptable given the proximity of a public park and children's playground.

In response to their queries, Members heard that some weight had been given to the previous submission which had now lapsed. The current application had been assessed against current policy. It was confirmed that there was sufficient room in the access road for two cars to pass each other safely. In terms of materials, Members were informed that materials would be conditioned to match as closely as possible

	<p>those of the existing houses in the same section of Sullivan Crescent.</p> <p>Members welcomed the increase in family dwellings. 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>
	<p>The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 9.45 pm.</p>

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Liz Penny on [epenny@hillingdon.gov.uk](mailto:epenny@hillingdon.gov.uk). Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.