

## Minutes

### HILLINGDON PLANNING COMMITTEE

01 November 2023

Meeting held at Committee Room 5 - Civic Centre



	<p><b>Committee Members Present:</b> Councillor Adam Bennett Roy Chamdal Darran Davies Elizabeth Garelick Henry Higgins Gursharan Mand Jagjit Singh</p> <p><b>Officers Present:</b> Katie Crosbie – Area Planning Service Manager Ed Laughton – Strategic Applications and PPA Manager Haydon Richardson – Principal Planning Officer Michael Briginshaw – Principal Planning Officer Chris Brady – Principal Planning Officer Dr Alan Tilly – Transport Planning and Development Manager Sehar Arshad – Legal Advisor Jimmy Walsh – Legal Advisor Steve Clarke – Democratic Services Officer</p>
1.	<p><b>ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN</b> (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b> That Councillor Henry Higgins was elected as Chairman of the Hillingdon Planning Committee for the remainder of the 2023/24 municipal year.</p>
2.	<p><b>ELECTION OF VICE-CHAIRMAN</b> (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b> That Councillor Adam Bennett was elected as Vice-Chairman of the Hillingdon Planning Committee for the remainder of the 2023/24 municipal year.</p>
3.	<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>There were no apologies for absence.</p>
4.	<p><b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS BEFORE THIS MEETING</b> (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>Councillor Roy Chamdal declared a non-pecuniary interest with regard to item 10 in that he knew the developer. Councillor Chamdal recused himself from the room for the duration of item 10 and did not take part in the vote.</p>
5.	<p><b>TO RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE MAJOR APPLICATIONS PLANNING COMMITTEE DATED 14 SEPTEMBER 2023</b> (<i>Agenda Item 5</i>)</p>

	<b>RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting of the Major Applications Planning Committee dated 14 September 2023 be approved as a correct record.</b>
6.	<p><b>TO RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF BOROUGH PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING DATED 05 OCTOBER 2023</b> (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p>The Democratic Services Officer noted that an amendment was required to the minutes of the 05 October 2023 Borough Planning Committee meeting. Within minute number 40 (28 Jacks Lane) the petitioner mentioned a proposed 6-bed house, this should have read as a proposed 5-bed house. The Committee agreed that this should be amended in the minutes.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting of the Borough Planning Committee dated 05 October 2023 be approved as a correct record subject to the agreed amendment.</b></p>
7.	<p><b>TO RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF MAJOR APPLICATIONS PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING DATED 11 OCTOBER 2023</b> (<i>Agenda Item 7</i>)</p> <p><b>RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting of the Major Applications Planning Committee dated 11 October 2023 be approved as a correct record.</b></p>
8.	<p><b>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 8</i>)</p> <p>There were none.</p>
9.	<p><b>TO CONFIRM THAT THE ITEMS MARKED IN PART 1 WILL BE CONSIDERED IN PUBLIC AND THOSE ITEMS MARKED IN PART 2 WILL BE HEARD IN PRIVATE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 9</i>)</p> <p>It was confirmed that all items were marked as Part 1 and would therefore be considered in public.</p>
10.	<p><b>2F BEACON CLOSE, UXBRIDGE - 78099/APP/2023/1735</b> (<i>Agenda Item 10</i>)</p> <p><b>Alterations to the existing house including the conversion of garage to habitable use and raising of garageroof height and erection of an attached 3-bedroom dwelling on land adjacent.</b></p> <p>Before the commencement of this item, Councillor Roy Chamdal recused himself from the room.</p> <p>Officers introduced the application and delivered a detailed presentation summarising the proposed development. Officers highlighted that the application was recommended for approval.</p> <p>A petition had been received objecting to the proposals. The lead petitioner had prepared a statement which was read out for the benefit of the Committee, key points raised in the statement included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposals would create a terrace of three houses instead of the existing one semi-detached structure on what was a quiet residential street.</li> </ul>

- The design of the proposed new building was inconsistent with the street scene. The fact that a similar development had been approved in Salt Hill Close was deemed irrelevant as petitioners felt the street scene in Beacon Close was fundamentally different to that of Salt Hill Close.
- The PTAL rating of the site was low and therefore the absence of viable public transport would maximise future residents' reliance upon the use of private vehicles adding to the traffic volumes on Beacon Close.
- The site was immediately adjacent to the junction with Harefield Road; any increase in kerbside parking would therefore heighten the potential for road traffic accidents on the junction.
- It was stated that the applicant had already removed and pruned landscaping on the site which rendered officers proposed condition 14 unnecessary.
- The extent of the new development would leave minimal external garden amenity space for 2F and the new house.
- Noise, disruption and traffic arising from construction of the development would cause considerable nuisance to neighbouring properties in Harefield Road and Beacon Close.

The agent for the application had also submitted a statement which was read out for the benefit of the Committee. Key points raised in the statement included:

- On road safety issues, it was stated that the development had been discussed with the local highways authority who had confirmed that the distance between the new parking space and the junction was sufficient to avoid any safety issues.
- On restricted parking space size, it was stated that the parameters of the space were in keeping with highways standards.
- On the creation of terraced housing, it was noted that the design had been modified as requested so that the front projection matched the adjacent dwellings of 2E and 2F. The creation of a three dwelling terrace would now be in keeping with the existing terrace at 15 to 2D Beacon Close.
- On matters raised by the petitioner on the inconsistency of designs with neighbouring houses, it was stated that the new dwelling would have facing brick, white cladding, concrete roof tiles and white upvc windows and doors which would match the adjacent property.

A written statement had been prepared by Councillor Keith Burrows, Ward Councillor for Uxbridge. The statement was read out to the Committee, key points raised in the statement included:

- The Ward Councillor fully supported the petitioners' objections to the proposed development.
- It was highlighted that Salt Hill Close had little in common with Beacon Close.
- The Committee were requested not to go with officers recommendations and were encouraged to defer determination for a site visit to better understand the petitioners' objections and the implications that the proposals would have on residents of Beacon Close.

On matters of parking spaces, Highways officers confirmed that the provision of car parking conformed with the standards of the London Plan highlighting that each property would retain one car parking space each. Members agreed that there were good existing public transport links which would alleviate use of on street parking.

With regard to the concerns raised by petitioners in terms of disruption from

construction, officers highlighted that there was a condition requiring a construction management plan which would reduce any adverse impacts on neighbours. Members discussed construction delivery times to ensure minimal impact on neighbouring properties during the construction phase; officers confirmed that hours of construction work could be restricted through the condition to ensure work took place during social hours only. With regard to construction delivery times specifically, it was confirmed that there was an informative regarding noise and nuisance and that deliveries to the site could be restricted to after 8am.

On matters of inconsistency between proposals and the existing street scene, the Committee agreed that the proposals were in fact in keeping with other properties in the vicinity. Officers highlighted that the previously refused application on this site had been for a bungalow, since that refusal, two properties to the rear site had been granted planning permissions. It was confirmed that the proposals in front of Members were for a matching attached terraced property, similar to the property next door.

The officers recommendation, inclusive of the amendment agreed to the Construction Management Plan condition restricting delivery times, was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

**RESOLVED:**

- 1) That the application be approved;**
- 2) That the Construction Management Plan condition be amended to restrict deliveries to the site to after 08:00.**

11. **ROOFTOP AT POINT WEST 1040 UXBRIDGE ROAD - 24/APP/2023/2114 (Agenda Item 11)**

**Alterations to the existing house including the conversion of garage to habitable use and raising of garage roof height and erection of an attached 3-bedroom dwelling on land adjacent.**

Before the commencement of this item, Councillor Roy Chamdal recused himself from the room.

Officers introduced the application and delivered a detailed presentation summarising the proposed development. Officers highlighted that the application was recommended for approval.

A petition had been received objecting to the proposals. The lead petitioner had prepared a statement which was read out for the benefit of the Committee, key points raised in the statement included:

- The proposals would create a terrace of three houses instead of the existing one semi-detached structure on what was a quiet residential street.
- The design of the proposed new building was inconsistent with the street scene. The fact that a similar development had been approved in Salt Hill Close was deemed irrelevant as petitioners felt the street scene in Beacon Close was fundamentally different to that of Salt Hill Close.
- The PTAL rating of the site was low and therefore the absence of viable public transport would maximise future residents' reliance upon the use of private vehicles adding to the traffic volumes on Beacon Close.

- The site was immediately adjacent to the junction with Harefield Road; any increase in kerbside parking would therefore heighten the potential for road traffic accidents on the junction.
- It was stated that the applicant had already removed and pruned landscaping on the site which rendered officers proposed condition 14 unnecessary.
- The extent of the new development would leave minimal external garden amenity space for 2F and the new house.
- Noise, disruption and traffic arising from construction of the development would cause considerable nuisance to neighbouring properties in Harefield Road and Beacon Close.

The agent for the application had also submitted a statement which was read out for the benefit of the Committee. Key points raised in the statement included:

- On road safety issues, it was stated that the development had been discussed with the local highways authority who had confirmed that the distance between the new parking space and the junction was sufficient to avoid any safety issues.
- On restricted parking space size, it was stated that the parameters of the space were in keeping with highways standards.
- On the creation of terraced housing, it was noted that the design had been modified as requested so that the front projection matched the adjacent dwellings of 2E and 2F. The creation of a three dwelling terrace would now be in keeping with the existing terrace at 15 to 2D Beacon Close.
- On matters raised by the petitioner on the inconsistency of designs with neighbouring houses, it was stated that the new dwelling would have facing brick, white cladding, concrete roof tiles and white upvc windows and doors which would match the adjacent property.

A written statement had been prepared by Councillor Keith Burrows, Ward Councillor for Uxbridge. The statement was read out to the Committee, key points raised in the statement included:

- The Ward Councillor fully supported the petitioners' objections to the proposed development.
- It was highlighted that Salt Hill Close had little in common with Beacon Close.
- The Committee were requested not to go with officers recommendations and were encouraged to defer determination for a site visit to better understand the petitioners' objections and the implications that the proposals would have on residents of Beacon Close.

On matters of parking spaces, Highways officers confirmed that the provision of car parking conformed with the standards of the London Plan highlighting that each property would retain one car parking space each. Members agreed that there were good existing public transport links which would alleviate use of on street parking.

With regard to the concerns raised by petitioners in terms of disruption from construction, officers highlighted that there was a condition requiring a construction management plan which would reduce any adverse impacts on neighbours. Members discussed construction delivery times to ensure minimal impact on neighbouring properties during the construction phase; officers confirmed that hours of construction work could be restricted through the condition to ensure work took place during social hours only. With regard to construction delivery times specifically, it was confirmed that there was an informative regarding noise and nuisance and that deliveries to the site

could be restricted to after 8am.

On matters of inconsistency between proposals and the existing street scene, the Committee agreed that the proposals were in fact in keeping with other properties in the vicinity. Officers highlighted that the previously refused application on this site had been for a bungalow, since that refusal, two properties to the rear site had been granted planning permissions. It was confirmed that the proposals in front of Members were for a matching attached terraced property, similar to the property next door.

The officers recommendation, inclusive of the amendment agreed to the Construction Management Plan condition restricting delivery times, was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

**RESOLVED:**

- 3) That the application be approved;**
- 4) That the Construction Management Plan condition be amended to restrict deliveries to the site to after 08:00.**

12. **MERCK SHARPE DOHME (MSD) SITE OFF BREAKSPEAR ROAD SOUTH - 72870/APP/2022/3126** (*Agenda Item 12*)

**Retention and demolition of existing buildings, construction of new buildings, all within Use Class B8 with ancillary uses, alongside hardstanding, widening of the vehicular access off Breakspear Road South, associated car and cycle parking, enhanced landscaping and ancillary works.**

Officers introduced the application and delivered a comprehensive presentation summarising the proposals. It was noted that, should the application not be determined by the Greater London Authority therefore obliging Hillingdon as the Local Planning Authority determining the application, that the application was recommended for approval subject to conditions and a Section 106 agreement.

The committee commended the incredibly thorough officer report. Members discussed the merits of the application which, although it was on green belt land, would reduce the footprint and volume of the buildings on site. The Committee discussed landscaping, particularly screening of the site during autumn and winter when landscaping and trees would be less effective at screening. The Committee highlighted that the Urban Design Officer had recommended a reduction of the storage heights on site to three metres to avoid storage areas being seen from the surrounding countryside during winter months; however it was noted that officers had conducted lengthy negotiations with the applicant and it was deemed that the proposed heights were the minimum heights that would make the operation viable, officers noted that there was a significant level of existing screening through landscaping and although there would be seasonal variation to this, it was deemed to consist a considerable level of screening.

Officers also confirmed that HS2 Ltd had been consulted on the proposals and no objections had been raised. Additionally, it was confirmed that any waste concerns would be covered by condition 30, the Delivery, Servicing and Waste Management Plan.

Members were supportive of the air quality contribution highlighted in the report and

	<p>sought to ensure that lighting levels were appropriate on site so as not to disrupt wildlife and that lighting levels were minimised when the site is not in use. Further to this, the Committee sought to add an informative ensuring that HGVs leaving the site did not go through Harefield Village and instead headed towards the A40.</p> <p>The officer's recommendation, inclusive of the amendments discussed, was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, unanimously approved.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1) That the application be approved as per the officer's recommendation;</b></li> <li><b>2) That a lighting condition be added ensuring that levels were mitigated to minimise disruption to wildlife; and,</b></li> <li><b>3) That an informative be added notifying site operators that HGVs leaving the site were not to proceed through Harefield Village.</b></li> </ol>
13.	<p><b>579-583 UXBRIDGE RD - 72470/APP/2023/747 (Agenda Item 13)</b></p> <p><b>An application submitted under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to vary Condition 2 (Approved Drawings) and 3 (General Compliance with Supporting Documentation) of planning permission reference 72470/APP/2016/4648, dated 02-10-2019, for the demolition of 3 dwellinghouses and redevelopment of the site to provide residential accommodation within 2 new buildings with associated access, parking, landscaping and amenity space. The amendment sought is to increase the number of dwellings by two, amendments to the vehicle and cycle parking provision.</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the application and delivered a detailed presentation summarising the application. Members attention was drawn to the addendum which proposed an amendment to condition 12 to secure a policy compliant level of accessible units. The application was recommended for approval subject to the proposed conditions.</p> <p>Members noted the PTAL rating of three for the site and sought clarification on the provision of car parking spaces for the development. Officers confirmed that the primary planning permission for this development would have been approved under the Local Plan parking standards which would have sought for a maximum parking allowance of one space per unit, however, officers now referred to the London Plan standards which were significantly less than the Local Plan standards. TfL had commented that the new application effectively generated a new planning permission, therefore they would like to see a further decrease in the number of parking spaces; officers had deemed this an unreasonable burden to place on the developer as the number of parking spaces had already previously been approved.</p> <p>The Committee highlighted that although there was a lack of garden amenity space on site, there were parks and green spaces very nearby. Officers recommendations, inclusive of the amendment to condition 12 highlighted in the addendum, were moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, unanimously approved.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED: That the application be approved as per the officer's recommendations.</b></p>
	<p>The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 8.35 pm.</p>

---

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