

Minutes

BOROUGH PLANNING COMMITTEE

5 September 2023

Meeting held at Committee Room 5 - Civic Centre



HILLINGDON
LONDON

	<p>Committee Members Present: Councillors Henry Higgins (Chairman) Darran Davies (Vice-Chairman) Ekta Gohil Gursharan Mand Jagjit Singh Philip Corthorne</p> <p>Officers Present: Katie Crosbie, Area Planning Service Manager Haydon Richardson, Principal Planning Officer Max Smith, Planning Team Leader Nesha Burnham, Principal Planning Officer Ana Griffiths, Transport Officer Sehar Arshad, Legal Advisor Jimmy Walsh, Legal Advisor Steve Clarke, Democratic Services Officer</p> <p>Ward Councillors Present: Councillor Sital Punja (Yiewsley Ward)</p>
23.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Choubedar and Sansarpuri with Councillor Corthorne substituting for Councillor Choubedar.</p>
24.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>Councillor Mand declared a non-pecuniary interest in item 6 as a Pinkwell Ward Councillor who had engaged with residents petitioning against the application. He recused himself from the room for the duration of the item and did not take part in the vote.</p> <p>Councillor Corthorne declared a non-pecuniary interest in item 10 as he had previously spoken against related applications for the site. He recused himself from the room for the duration of the item and did not take part in the vote.</p>
25.	<p>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting dated 12 July 2023 be approved as a correct record.</p>

26.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>There were none.</p>
27.	<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 (<i>Agenda Item 5</i>)</p> <p>It was confirmed that all items of business were marked Part 1 and would be considered in public.</p>
28.	<p>GARAGES AT CRANFORD DRIVE, HAYES - 77448/APP/2023/1159 (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p>Before the start of this item, Councillor Mand recused himself from the room.</p> <p>Officers delivered a detailed presentation summarising the application and highlighted that the application was recommended for approval subject to the conditions set out in the officer's report.</p> <p>A petition had been received objecting to the proposals. The petition organiser was present and addressed the Committee. Key points raised in their address included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There were serious concerns raised over the impact that the proposals would have regarding the privacy and overlooking of residents on Cranford Drive, specifically with regard to the close proximity of the two storey buildings being proposed. Petitioners felt that this was in breach of policy DMH 6 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2. There were also concerns raised that the new properties would overlook the adjacent public amenity space. • It was highlighted that various trees in the gardens of current residents would be encroaching on the proposed 1.5m wide alleyway to be shared by the occupants of the new development. It was felt that this could lead to conflict between neighbours and that there would be a constant flow of people within the small alleyway. • The petitioner noted that there would be an unacceptable loss of daylight/sunlight impacting neighbouring residential amenities. Further to this, numbers 178 and 180 had small extensions when compared to other properties which made the daylight/sunlight impact more substantial for the other properties. • The removal of trees was of concern and their replacement would take a significant amount of time to mature. The distance between the development and the motorway was around 40m and the trees were significant in providing greenery and mitigating noise emanating from the motorway. • There were concerns regarding the increase in traffic and noise on what was already a busy road in close proximity to Cranford Park Academy. • The Committee were encouraged to conduct a site visit to see the parameters of the site first hand and understand why the petitioners felt that the new development would constitute overcrowding. <p>The applicant was also present and addressed the Committee. Key points raised during their address included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One car parking space would be provided for each of the proposed houses in

accordance with London Plan policies and secure cycle storage would also be provided in each garden. It was also confirmed that the Highways Authority had no objection to the proposals.

- The applicant had arranged a specialist daylight/sunlight study, as requested by planning officers, which confirmed that there were no undue impacts on the surrounding properties. Attention was drawn to the officer's report which stated that "overall, the proposed development would have an acceptable impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties.
- All existing dwellings around the site fronted onto public roads accessible to fire and emergency vehicles.
- The site was currently fully occupied by hardstanding and garages. The proposed site layout showed a significant proportion of the land coverage would be changed to trees, communal planting and gardens. The Borough's Tree Officer also considered the proposals acceptable.
- The size of the dwellings and their gardens exceeded the London Plan recommended minimum sizes and the officer's report indicated that a condition would be applied, should the application be approved, which would ensure the construction included special measures to mitigate noise from the nearby motorway.

A written representation had also been received from Councillors Gill and Lakhmana of Pinkwell Ward. Their statement was read out for the Committee, key points raised included:

- The proposed construction of two-storey houses directly adjacent to the current residences on Cranford Drive, with only a 1.5-meter alleyway in between, posed a significant threat to the privacy of existing and future residents. Disregarding Policy DMH 6 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2.
- The presence of trees within the gardens of current residents encroached upon the shared alleyway/main entrance used by new residents.
- Clarity was requested regarding daylight/sunlight measurements where the petitioners felt there was a significant impact on daylight/sunlight loss.
- The proposal to cut seven mature trees and replant new ones may negatively impact air quality, especially in an area already compromised by pollution and nearby to a primary school.
- The narrow alleyway of 1.5 meters raised concerns about delayed fire and emergency access, with sprinkler systems not being sufficient to cover the potential risks.
- Given the ongoing development of approximately 1,000 new homes in the Pinkwell Ward, further strain on public roads and schools was expected. The limited parking spaces for new houses and the shared entrance with the place of worship and food bank would exacerbate overcrowding issues.
- New residents were allocated less than 60 sqm of outdoor space, which was below the requirement. The reliance on a nearby public park not owned by the developer to meet this requirement raised concerns about privacy and adequacy of private outdoor spaces.

Officers clarified that the 1.5m alleyway would have the rear fences of the Cranford Drive properties to one side and the proposed four new dwellings to the other side; it was confirmed that there would not be any overlooking from the alleyway into the Cranford Drive properties. In terms of the new dwellings there would be a first storey hallway window which would be obscure glazed to prevent overlooking from the new dwellings towards the Cranford Drive properties. The narrowness of the alleyway had

been raised by the petitioner as a concern, officers confirmed that the 1.5m width was accessible for those using the alleyway including, bikes, pushchairs, wheelchairs and those taking refuse bins out.

With regard to trees, it was confirmed that seven trees were going to be removed and five were going to be replaced. The Committee felt it necessary to add to the landscaping condition to ensure that all seven trees were replaced.

On the daylight/sunlight concerns highlighted by the petitioners and the ward councillors, officers had highlighted that there was a marginal breach in the 25-degree line measurement by the peak of the gable of the proposed dwellings. Due to the breach, officers wanted to ensure that a separate assessment of the daylight/sunlight matters occurred. The subsequent report received showed that there would be no significant loss of light and no significant overshadowing. Despite the marginal breach, officers deemed this to be acceptable.

Petitioners and Ward Councillors had raised concerns regarding traffic levels, officers highlighted that the existing 24 garages on the site, should they have been in regular use, would have generated more traffic than the four dwellings proposed.

Officers clarified that, with regard to policy DMH 6 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2, the report addressed these concerns noting that this was an exceptional case where backland development was deemed acceptable due to the brownfield nature of the site, street access leading to the site and that it was already an area of hardstanding.

Highlighting potential concerns around anti-social behaviour within the alleyway, the Committee sought to ensure more detailed information on how the proposal would address potential criminality. It was deemed that officers would investigate these matters further with the agent and the details would be referred back to the Chairman.

The officer's recommendation, in addition to the proposed amendments to the conditions and the amendments included in the addendum, was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, agreed by four votes to one.

RESOLVED:

- 1) That the application be approved;**
- 2) That the landscaping condition be amended to require the replacement of all seven of the removed trees with high carbon-absorbing mature trees;**
- 3) That officers seek further detail from the agent with regard to mitigation of anti-social behaviour in the alleyway and refer this information back to the Chairman.**

29. **KIRK HOUSE, 97 HIGH STREET, WEST DRAYTON - 32928/APP/2023/753** (*Agenda Item 7*)

Officers introduced the application and gave a detailed presentation summarising the proposals noting that the application was recommended for approval subject to the suggested conditions, including restricting prospective residents from applying for residents parking permits in the local parking management scheme.

A petition had been submitted objecting to the proposals. One of the lead petitioners was present and addressed the Committee. Key points raised during their address

included:

- Two previous related applications had been refused.
- It was deemed that the freeholders of the building had not informed the residents and leaseholders of Kirk House of the proposals and no proper consultation had taken place.
- There was no concrete floor between the second floor and the loft space where the new dwellings were proposed. This would lead to significant levels of additional noise impacting those residents on the 2nd floor.
- There would be significant disruption to residents' lives, in addition to the school and the church, during the construction phase. Furthermore, the car park would face significant disruption during this phase and shift workers living in the building would be impacted considerably.
- Concerns were raised regarding whether there was enough water pressure to accommodate the new dwellings.
- The proposals would have a significant impact on the architecture and character of the street.
- It was deemed that the proposals were purely made for the developers gain and did not take into account the needs of the residents.

The agent for the application was present and addressed the Committee. Key points raised during their address included:

- The proposed scheme was the result of extensive proactive engagement with the Planning Authority and represented a low impact, highly sustainable proposal to provide eight additional dwellings at Kirk House, helping Hillingdon to meet its housing targets.
- The proposals would not have a significant impact on the character of the building, or the local area.
- During the construction phase, disruption would be minimised by not taking any material up through the building itself, instead lifting them directly into the loft space through cavities in the roof of the building.
- The floor construction between the 2nd floor and the loft space would significantly exceed the requirements for acoustic mitigation outlined in building regulations.
- The windows on the new habitable roof would be setback and would therefore not lead to any additional overlooking.
- The six proposed parking spaces were in line with the London Plan as the maximum amount allowed. These spaces were already part of the car park and were not currently allocated to any residents.
- A new disabled compliant lift would be installed in the building.
- It was noted that the Local Planning Authority carried out all statutory consultations with residents and the developer had written to residents to inform them of the plans.
- The service charge applied to each of the current dwellings would reduce as the charge would be shared between eight further dwellings in the building.
- It was clarified that there would be no loss of parking during the construction phase as there was a space owned by the developers which would be utilised by vehicles bringing materials onto site. There would be scaffolding but it would not impact on the availability of parking spaces.
- It was highlighted that there was capacity regarding water pressure to accommodate the new dwellings.
- It was noted that the initial development of Kirk House from an office space to residential use was carried out under prior approval with no requirement for

landscaping. The Committee felt that the planters and landscaping currently in place could be improved.

Councillor Sital Punja was present as a Ward Councillor for Yiewsley and addressed the Committee. Key points of their address included:

- It was felt that there was no proper consultation carried out by the developer with residents of Kirk House.
- It was highlighted that the proposals could not be considered as best use of a brownfield site as there were existing residential dwellings and the site should have already been considered in best use.
- Concerns were raised over some of the existing windows on the lower floors which were side opening, in that the windows were side opening and not double glazed.
- There remained significant noise concerns regarding impact noises from new residents in the proposed dwellings.
- With regard to overlooking, the screening provided by trees on site would not be affective in mitigating overlooking from the new dwellings.

Due to the concerns raised by petitioners and the Ward Councillor, the Committee sought clarification regarding the consultations that had taken place to ensure that all lawful and statutory consultations had been carried out. Officers confirmed that this was the case as detailed in the report officer's.

Officers clarified that, with regard to overlooking, there were already existing habitable windows in the building looking in all directions, including the church and primary school which was of particular concern to residents. Officers highlighted that the windows on the loft floor would be set back and it was deemed that there would be no additional level of overlooking.

Members queried whether, if the application were to be approved, the materials condition could be amended to specify the inclusion of a sample of the grey aluminium panel proposed for the dormer extensions. The Committee agreed that this should be included.

The Committee were minded to specifically amend the construction management plan condition to specify the hours of construction in an effort to mitigate disruption to residents. Additionally, the Committee sought to have a scaffolding plan to ensure sufficient parking was maintained during the construction phase. This was agreed and delegated to officers to amend the condition and bring it back to the Chairman for sign off.

The Committee specifically questioned the proposed housing mix. Officers confirmed that, whilst the housing mix didn't add any family housing, there would be no loss of family housing and the development would complement the Borough's housing need.

On landscaping matters, the Committee sought to amend the landscaping condition to specifically require soft landscaping, for example a living roof, green wall, or planting to be introduced to enhance the site and accommodate the intensification of residential use. Officers confirmed that this could be done and additional planting could be agreed with the developer in writing prior to commencement.

The officer's recommendation, inclusive of the amendments to conditions agreed by the Committee, was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, agreed with four votes

in favour and two abstentions.

RESOLVED:

- 1) That the application be approved;
- 2) That it be delegated to officers to amend the construction management plan condition to include a scaffolding plan to ensure sufficient parking is maintained during construction and to specify the hours of construction, and hours for loading and unloading of vehicles; and for this to come back to the Chairman for sign off.
- 3) That the materials condition be amended to specify the inclusion of a sample of the grey aluminium panel proposed for the dormer extensions.
- 4) That the landscaping condition be amended to specifically require soft landscaping to enhance the site and accommodate the intensification of residential use.

30. **4 ROFANT ROAD, NORTHWOOD - 6923/APP/2023/545** (*Agenda Item 8*)

Officers introduced the application and delivered a detailed presentation summarising the application. It was highlighted that the application was recommended for refusal and the reasons for refusal were outlined.

A petition had been received objecting to the application, one of the lead petitioners was present and addressed the Committee. Key points raised during their address included:

- Petitioners thanked officers for their assessment of the application and the recommendation for refusal.
- The proposals were contrary to Council policy in being a back garden development.
- The proposed scale, design and materials would be out of character with the existing developments of Rofant Road and Ashbourne Square, and the proposed building would fundamentally alter the nature of the area, which was town houses.
- The proposals would interfere with some valuable trees which were under a tree protection order.
- Petitioners had concerns over the provision of dropped kerb access from the site onto Ashbourne Square.
- The subterranean nature of the development raised concerns regarding whether excavation of the site could aggravate damage to the road surface.

A written statement had been received from the agent on behalf of the applicant, which was read out for the Committee. Key points raised in the statement included:

- The applicant had been attempting to have proposals approved for two years and a pre-application had been very favourable.
- Following the first application, the concerns of the Planning Authority were adhered to and it was highlighted that the National Planning Policy Framework noted that sustainable development had three components: social, economic and environmental.
- The Committee were encouraged to conduct a site visit to see how the proposals would impact only impact number four Rofant Road, which was owned by the applicant.

	<p>Members commented on the application noting that the standard of living did not seem adequate within the proposed dwelling, the bulk, height and depth of the dwelling was also of great concern. The officer's recommendation for refusal was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the application be refused.</p>
31.	<p>22 FRINGEWOOD CLOSE, NORTHWOOD - 42066/APP/2022/3824 (<i>Agenda Item 9</i>)</p> <p>At 21:00 the Committee took a comfort break, reconvening at 21:05.</p> <p>Officers introduced the application noting that it was deferred from July's Committee meeting for a site visit. The Committee site visit had taken place and officer recommendation remained for refusal.</p> <p>Members highlighted some important photographs taken at the site visit which illustrated a better understanding of the garden space as it currently stood. Whilst Members were sympathetic to the reasons for the development and highlighted the extensive discussions which took place at the previous Committee meeting. It was highlighted that the bulk and size of the development was of particular concern and that the proposals, if approved, would set a harmful precedent. The applicants were encouraged to engage with the Planning Department on adjustments that could be made to make the proposals acceptable.</p> <p>The officer's recommendation to refuse was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the application be refused.</p>
32.	<p>PEMBROKE HOUSE, RUISLIP - 38324/APP/2022/2010 (<i>Agenda Item 10</i>)</p> <p>This item was taken following item 11. Councillor Corthorne, who had declared a non-pecuniary interest, left the room for the duration of the item and did not take part in the vote.</p> <p>Officers introduced the item giving a summary of the application and noting that it was recommended for approval. Officers elaborated on previous concerns from residents that the premises was in use as standalone housing, rather than in use as an office. It was confirmed that a site visit had taken place and the premises was in use as an office; furthermore, the application in front of Members did not seek to change the use class.</p> <p>The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, unanimously approved.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the application be approved.</p>
33.	<p>12 MARSWORTH CLOSE - 77767/APP/2023/1355 (<i>Agenda Item 11</i>)</p> <p>This item was taken ahead of item 10.</p> <p>Officers introduced the application highlighting that it was recommended for approval subject to the suggested conditions noted in the report. Officers noted that some works</p>

	<p>had already taken place but had since been paused pending the outcome of the application at Committee.</p> <p>Members asked officers whether the approximately 10cm raised platform could lead to drainage issues in inclement weather impacting the neighbouring property. Officers confirmed that the raised platform was within permitted development rights and that it would not be advisable to condition drainage matters as the proposed area of hardstanding was minimal and there was room for rainwater run-off.</p> <p>The Committee noted their disappointment that works had commenced despite the application not yet being approved. The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, unanimously approved.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the application be approved.</p>
	<p>The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 9.30 pm.</p>

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Steve Clarke on 01895 250 636
Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.