

Minutes

HILLINGDON PLANNING COMMITTEE

06 December 2023

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



HILLINGDON
LONDON

	<p>Committee Members Present: Councillor Henry Higgins (Chair) Councillor Adam Bennett (Vice-Chair) Councillor Philip Corthorne Councillor Farhad Choubedar Councillor Elizabeth Garelick Councillor June Nelson Councillor Jagjit Singh</p> <p>Officers Present: Roz Johnson – Head of Development Management and Building Control Katie Crosbie – Area Planning Service Manager Ed Laughton – Strategic Applications and PPA Manager Chris Brady – Planning Team Leader Michael Briginshaw – Principal Planning Officer Haydon Richardson – Principal Planning Officer Christos Chrysanthou – Planning Officer Dr Alan Tilly – Transport Planning and Development Team Manager Sehar Arshad – Legal Advisor Jimmy Walsh – Legal Advisor Ryan Dell – Democratic Services Officer</p>
14.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies were received from Councillor Roy Chamdal, with Councillor Philip Corthorne substituting.</p> <p>Apologies were received from Councillor Darran Davies, with Councillor Farhad Choubedar substituting.</p> <p>Apologies were also received from Councillor Gursharan Mand, with Councillor June Nelson substituting.</p>
15.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>Councillor Adam Bennett declared a non-pecuniary interest with regard to items 8 and 9 in that he knew the petitioner. Councillor Bennett recused himself from the room for the duration of items 8 and 9 and did not take part in the vote.</p>
16.	<p>TO RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting of the Hillingdon Planning</p>

	Committee dated 01 November 2023 be approved as a correct record.
17.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>There were none.</p>
18.	<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 were marked as Part I and would therefore be considered in public.</p>
19.	<p>MAJOR APP: LAND AT YIEWSLEY LIBRARY AND FORMER YIEWSLEY POOL, FALLING LANE AND OTTERFIELD ROAD - 76795/APP/2023/2503 (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p>Formal Description: Demolition of existing Yiewsley Library Building and the erection of a new residential building on the Yiewsley Library site (Falling Lane) and the erection of a new mixed use building on the former Yiewsley Swimming Pool site (Otterfield Road), with a replacement library at ground floor level, residential uses above and new pedestrian access off of the High Street.</p> <p>Detailed Description: Demolition of existing Yiewsley Library Building and the erection of a 5-storey residential building, comprising 50 dwellings, with 28 undercroft parking spaces (13 for residential and 15 for use by Rabbsfarm Primary School). The Otterfield Road site proposes the erection of a 5-storey building, comprising 45 dwellings, with 25 car parking spaces (23 for residential and 2 for library users).</p> <p>Officers noted that there was an addendum on this item, which contained changes to two key conditions.</p> <p>A written representation from the lead petitioner was read out:</p> <p><i>Thank you for the opportunity to present this statement in support of the petition.</i></p> <p><i>Where is the evidence of Yiewsley residents saying we want more flats?</i></p> <p><i>The opposite is the case. We counted the residential developments in Yiewsley. Since 2008, we estimate that 1,525 residential units have been built. There may be more. Hillingdon Council does not appear to publish a site map with the number of new residential units that have been built by ward for Council Tax payers to assess.</i></p> <p><i>For a long time, residents of Yiewsley have felt they are ignored by Hillingdon Council. For example, in 2017 we organised a paper petition which said: "We formally request that Hillingdon Council provides funds to build and run a new swimming pool at the site of the old Yiewsley pool off Otterfield Road."</i></p> <p><i>Currently, the Leisure Centre which Hillingdon Council decided to build in West Drayton, a waste of Council Taxpayers' money, is sitting as an</i></p>

empty building site with the company that was building the Leisure Centre having gone into administration. If the Council had accepted that Yiewsley residents' petition proposal, we would have had a compact pool on the Otterfield Road site. It would have withstood the economic risks that the Ukraine/ Russian war have caused in terms of energy costs to swimming pools up and down the country. Residents could leave their children swimming in a safe small local pool and go shopping, in Tesco, Aldi, Iceland and had a cup of coffee and a custard tart in Alma Lusa café down the High Street.

I had a stroke in 2019 and have not attended today's Hillingdon Council Planning Committee in person owing to ongoing health issues.

Accessibility of the Planning Documents

Since my stroke, as a Disabled person, I have experienced difficulties reading documents. I used to enjoy reading, mainly sci fi books, but find it very difficult to read long documents, especially ones that are online.

Most residents do not understand the Planning documents that have been posted on Hillingdon Council's website.

We counted the number pages of the proposed Planning Application being considered by the Planning Committee on Wednesday 6th December 2023. The number of pages came to 1,357. When we asked the Planning Officer which planning policies applied, he sent us a list and the number of pages in the policies came to 1,869. It is obviously impossible to read all these and to understand complex Planning Laws in such a short space of time.

We would formally request that the Committee remove this item from the Agenda of the December 2023 meeting to allow more time for residents to consider the proposals.

As far as I could see, the Planning Officer's report did not include in his report the outcome of the so-called Consultation which occurred in October 2023 at Yiewsley Library. This said that the majority who attended were against these proposals. We found this out after a Freedom of Information Act request, which took longer than the correct timescale. The Borough Solicitor wrote:

"The reason for the delay is that in July 2023 the Council introduced a new ICT system for dealing with freedom of information requests. We had expected the new system to streamline the process but, unfortunately, it has had the opposite effect. It has proven very difficult to keep track of requests and it was for this reason that in September 2023 we reverted to using the old system which, although cumbersome, has helped improve performance significantly. Unfortunately, the glitches in our new system meant that it was not possible to deal with your request for Internal Review within our usual timescale."

This maladministration means that information was not available in time for

people to make effective responses to Planning Applications. Hillingdon is making this Application on its own behalf, yet the Planning Officer refused to disclose details of what the Pre-Application advice was. Hillingdon Council wants to mark its own homework. Nolan Principles require Openness and Accountability.

The Stroke Association leaflet called 'What We think About Air Pollution' published in 2019, says that "Air Pollution increases your risk of stroke....[I]t contributes to an estimated 21% of strokes worldwide and in England alone, experts predict it will contribute to around 106,000 strokes by 2035." The report links the increased risk of a stroke to a footnote - A., Shah, et al Short Term exposure to air pollution and stroke: systematic review and meta-analysis BMJ 2015

Available: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25810496>

'Air Quality in Hillingdon – A Guide for Public Health Professionals' was published by the Greater London Assembly in 2022. This report shows that Yiewsley schools, including St Matthew's Church of England Primary School, Rabbs Farm School, the Skills Hub, and Pride Academy are all listed as having pollution levels exceeding WHO guidelines at pages 51-53. In Yiewsley High Street the report shows it is a pollution hot spot page 30.

The prevalence of asthma within Yiewsley is 5.47%, which is lower than England, but higher than London, Hillingdon, and the locality – source Yiewsley ward profile.

The Chair noted that some of the submission was irrelevant to the planning application itself.

The applicant attended and addressed the Committee:

There were a number of benefits of this application. There would be 100% affordable housing, providing 95 new homes at London affordable rents. 20% were three-bed, 37% were two-bed and 43% were one-bed. A further 10% would be wheelchair accessible.

Extensive engagement with the community and stakeholders had resulted in significant design changes to address concerns. Specifically, the height of the development was reduced from seven stories to five as part of the consultation process.

Commitments had been made to enhance the recreation ground. This included plans for a new playground, a family-focused landscape garden, and extensive tree planting in the recreation ground area.

There are proposals to upgrade the public pedestrian access route to the library from the town centre. This will involve improvements such as new lighting, footpaths, and signage.

The development will provide spaces for the Rabbs Farm School parking, ensuring continuity of the existing facilities.

The usable area of the library has been increased by 20%, providing a modern

and versatile space to accommodate a wide range of services. Additionally, there's a dedicated 75 square meters of community space included within the library.

The development takes measures to protect the ancient highway that runs along the boundary of the site.

Finally, the development is described as highly sustainable, utilising two Brownfield sites owned by the council to create a sustainable living space.

This information outlines the various aspects and commitments of the proposed development, emphasising community engagement, recreation enhancements, library space, parking, historical preservation, and sustainability measures.

Councillor Punja addressed the Committee as Yiewsley Ward Councillor:

Residents have been fighting against the residential development of Yiewsley recreation ground since 2011. This application has appropriated land gifted to the residents in 1926 which was protected by a covenant to remain forever recreational. The Local Plan has been cast aside for this planning application and it should be refused.

Quantity over quality: Clause three of the Local Plan says 70% are meant to be two and three-bedroom homes. Only 56% are so, when waiting lists for family homes are critical. Single aspect properties are a symbol of poor-quality housing. Section 7.9 of the Local Plan says that quantity will not be provided at the expense of quality. Nearly half of the properties have windows on only one side. Why is poor quality being recommended for planning approval?

Air quality: The air quality assessment records figures from 2019. More recent figures are needed to assess the pollution impact. The advantage of mechanical ventilation is it enables developers to build in areas of poor air quality where windows cannot be opened. The disadvantages are high energy consumption, high repair costs, noise and vibration, and moisture buildup leading to mould. These represented a burden on the Council budget. Hillingdon should not be asking people to live in areas where they cannot open a window because the air quality is so bad.

Healthy Street strategy: This application takes into consideration the Healthy Street strategy yet approves the removal of a library from its ideal High Street location where it is with an ease of public transport with a bus stop right outside on route home from school, a safe to access place for public amenities, an anchor for regeneration and a quiet space for rest. Yiewsley Library in its current location meets the Healthy Street strategy, the relocation will not.

Precedence: Previously a health centre, gym and residential dwelling was given planning permission. It is true precedence has been set but the health centre with gym brought untold value to the community. The need for a health centre was critical then and is critical now. The relocation of the library gives no additional needed facilities.

Environment: According to Hillingdon's Open Space strategy 2011 Yiewsley was deficient in Green Space by 40 hectares. The population has grown but green

spaces haven't increased so appropriating land donated for recreation is simply disingenuous. It was disappointing that Yiewsley residents have been ignored and local communities ruined by continuous poor planning decisions that blight Yiewsley.

Councillor Abby addressed the Committee as Ward Councillor:

The Council motto was 'Putting Residents First'. It was hoped that the Committee would listen to the residents of Yiewsley and Cowley. It was vital that elected Members represent residents.

Having heard the representations, officers gave some clarifications:

- The petitioner questioned the need for residential housing. Section 7.01 of the Committee report explained that the London Plan set challenging housing targets for all London Boroughs and for Hillingdon there was a 10-year housing target of 10,830 homes. The site was within the Heathrow Opportunity area which was defined as in the London Plan as an area with high potential for development growth. This area had an indicative capacity of 13,000 new homes and 11,000 new jobs. This scheme would deliver 95 affordable homes, 100% affordable homes and all 100% London affordable rent.
- On accessibility of planning documents, the Council had carried out all of the statutory consultation in accordance with planning legislation. Where officers had been approached by residents requiring additional need, officers had accommodated to the best of their ability. Therefore, officers were satisfied that there had been a fair opportunity for resident to take part in the planning process.
- The applicant had made reference to their own consultation from October 2022. There had been changes to the scheme following this and so as part of the planning process it was important that the Planning Authority carried out its own consultation, which it what had been done, and the planning decision was based on this.
- A point had been raised about the pre-application process. It was commented that planning officers had not divulged comments that were made at pre-application stage. It was noted that pre-applications were submitted and dealt with in confidence. While the applicant was the Council, they had been treated, as applicant, in the same way as all other applicants.
- On air pollution, the development as proposed was air quality neutral and there was mitigation measure proposed in the form of a contribution which would ensure that the development was then air quality positive. This was a requirement because of the designations for this particular site. There were sufficient mitigation measures provided in the form of a travel plan and additional tree planting which would help with air quality issues. The application sought to remove 10 trees and plant 30, giving a net increase of 20 trees. There was also an offset contribution which would go towards assisting with delivering the Council's air quality action plan.
- Covenants relating to land were not a planning matter and so it was not something that could be taken into consideration as part of the assessment. For Members' information it was noted that there had been a separate legal process whereby there had been an appropriation of land for planning purposes, which in effect released it from the covenant.
- On the relocation of the library, the relocated Library would still fall within the boundary of the Town Centre. The relocated library would also be of a higher accessibility standard and include an accessible community space and so this

complied with planning policy.

- On the quality of the build, it was suggested that the issue related to single aspect units. Section 7.9 of the Committee report outlined the number of single and triple aspect units. There were no single aspect units which would be north facing.
- On open space, it had been documented in the appeal history on surrounding sites that the appeal inspector had not agreed with the Council's provision for securing financial contributions towards open space. This scheme did not secure a financial obligation, it delivered an enhancement to the public open space. There was no development within the public open space.

It was noted that there was an addendum on this item. There were some amendments to conditions proposed which related to the landscaping condition for the two sites and an addition into the condition wording to include a requirement for pollution-absorbing plants to be included in the soft landscaping to improve air quality.

Members noted the positive of making use of an unused brownfield site; 100% affordable housing; a new playground; a bigger library.

Members noted that it had been suggested that the Local Plan had been cast aside. Members asked for clarification that this was not the case. Officers clarified that when an application was assessed against the development plan, there were a multitude of policies to look at and various criteria. It was required to assess the development as a whole. This meant that there may be minor conflicts but overall, officers were satisfied that the application complied with the development plan.

Members asked about the impact on nearby residential properties being acceptable and asked if this was based on an objective assessment of the subjective view of the case officer. Section 7.8 of the report detailed the assessment on neighbouring properties, including impacts on daylight, sunlight, overshadowing and overlooking, privacy and outlook. As the site was in excess of 21 meters (as per the Local Plan), these elements were not considered to be an issue. There had also been a daylight and sunlight report submitted by the applicant which had been robustly tested by an external consultant.

Members asked about the sufficiency of parking spaces for the elderly. Officers noted that the car park adjacent to the existing library, was not designated as a library car park. There were two spaces being provided, those were accessible spaces. The relocated library would be directly bounded by a Council car park which would provide adequate overflow provision within very reasonable distance to the site entrance.

Reference was made to a previous health centre, and officer noted that a health centre had been opened directly opposite the current site.

Members asked for clarification on green space. Officer noted that there had been a recent case where the Open Space strategy had been used as a reason for refusal. because no on-site provision of open space was provided and there was also a shortfall in private amenity space. The current scheme was different because there was adequate provision of private usable amenity space and community amenity space. The development plan allowed a financial contribution to be taken towards this. However, in the previous case, the appeal inspector did not agree with the Council's decision to refuse the application based on the lack of open space and saw fit to agree a financial contribution. In the current case, the applicant was providing an

enhancement plan and they were actually to do the works as part of this planning application and that would be secured within the heads of terms.

Officers summarised that developments would be required to mitigate their own harm. The Council's Air Quality Officer, within the report, stated that this application would mitigate its own harm through a travel plan, reduction in trips, and additional tree planting. All of those factors and a sustainable development made this development air quality neutral. Officers noted that there was a requirement to deliver an air quality positive scheme within this particular area. The cost contribution which was being sought and would be paid for by the applicant would help the Council to deliver their own action plan to prevent future issues of air quality within this area. The key point was that there would be no additional air quality harm generated by this development.

Members raised concerns about affordable housing being separate from other housing and fire safety. On affordable housing, the site was surrounded by a lot of what may be considered to be 'market housing'. The new library would be available to everyone. The ambitious targets for affordable housing needed to be met and this site far exceeded other sites. On fire safety, the building to the top of the parapet was 17.5 meters and 18.5 meters to the top of the lift overrun and the plant room equipment. The scheme has been designed to adhere to the highest fire safety standards in accordance with policy D12 but there was a condition (condition 33) requiring a revised fire safety strategy to provide further details in accordance with that policy. Fire safety would also form part of building regulations application so more evidence and a more detailed assessment of fire safety would happen then.

Officers' recommendations were moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, agreed.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved

20. **MAJOR APP: 15 GREEN LANE, NORTHWOOD - 68153/APP/2023/1895** (*Agenda Item 7*)

Section 73 application to vary condition 2 of planning permission ref: 68153/APP/2019/1319, dated 27-05-2020, (Redevelopment of site to erect a two storey building with a basement and accommodation at roof level to provide 12 residential units with associated works), to allow revisions to the parking arrangements on site, incorporating the removal of the basement and moving the car parking from the basement to the surface level (situated in front of the consented block) and associated external amendments to the site.

Officer introduced the application, noting the addendum which pertained to a clarification on no parking in front of the ancient Oak tree and an amendment to condition 6 to improve air quality. Officers also noted that concerns had been raised by residents regarding increased vehicle movements and noise due to the new parking arrangement. However, there would actually be a reduction in parking spaces from 16 to 10, and the proposal aligned with the London plan's parking standards. Officers further clarified that the London Plan policy would allow nine car parking spaces so it was one space above the maximum. The site was scored as having reasonable access to public transport compared to London as a whole. There were parking restrictions outside the site which should avoid any problems arising from car parking displacement.

Officers' recommendations were moved, seconded and, when put to a vote,

unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved as per officer's recommendations

21. **MINOR APP: CEDAR HOUSE, VINE LANE - 12019/APP/2021/2298** (*Agenda Item 8*)

Proposed change of use from Office (Class B1) to Assisted Living Care Beds (Class C2) with internal and external alterations to include a new bin store and access ramp.

Councillor Bennett left the room at the start of this item and returned following the conclusion of item 9.

Items 8 and 9 were presented together.

Officer introduced the application and noted the addendum which related to brief corrections regarding the Highways section of the report and the conditions.

The lead petitioner attended and made the following points:

- The building in question was poorly maintained, as a listed building within a conservation area.
- The objection was not to an assisted living facility but rather to its proposed location. Vine Lane was a busy road; there was a busy pub at the end; there were concerns over traffic speed; there was no crossing and so it would be difficult for vulnerable people to cross the road.
- It was suggested that 400 vehicles per hour used the road.
- The suggested of an impact statement and CCTV were noted.
- There was no change in the parking in the area. Vine Lane was very congested with drop-offs to Bishopshalt School and people using it as an alternative route to Long Lane.
- The question of a turning circle for an ambulance and electric vehicle charging points were raised.
- This was an historic building situated within a Conservation Area.
- If this application was recommended to go ahead, it was suggested to defer until these points could be addressed.

The design had been scrutinised by both the Council's Heritage Officer and Historic England. Therefore, officers were confident that, subject to conditions, the development would meet policy tests of either preserving or enhancing the grade two building.

Members shared concerns about road safety and accessibility due to the high traffic flow, highlighting the challenges for vulnerable residents and those using wheelchairs. Officers noted there would be electric vehicle charging points and there was a Parking Management Scheme in operation. In its current use as offices the development could generate 86 trips on a daily basis. With its change of use to a care home that number would fall to 16.

Members focused on the need for supported housing, seeking clarification about an assessment of need, to which the officers confirmed that the adult social care team supported the proposal.

Officers clarified that ambulances would be able to enter and exit the site in a forward direction.

	<p>Officers' recommendations were moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, agreed.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the application be approved as per officer's recommendations</p>
22.	<p>MINOR APP: CEDAR HOUSE, VINE LANE - 12019/APP/2021/2299 (<i>Agenda Item 9</i>)</p> <p>Proposed change of use from Office (Class B1) to Assisted Living Care Beds (Class C2) with internal and external alterations to include a new bin store and access ramp (Application for Listed Building Consent).</p> <p>Items 8 and 9 were presented together.</p> <p>Councillor Bennett left the room prior to the previous item and returned following the conclusion of this item.</p> <p>Officers' recommendations were moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, agreed.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the application be approved as per officer's recommendations</p>
23.	<p>MINOR APP: 10 NORTON ROAD - 77809/APP/2023/1129 (<i>Agenda Item 10</i>)</p> <p>Erection of a two storey side extension with pitch roof and single storey side and rear extension with pitch and flat roof.</p> <p>Officers introduced the application, noting the addendum which noted that there be no roof alteration without further permission from the Planning Authority.</p> <p>A written representation from the lead petitioner was read out:</p> <p><i>In June, residents submitted a petition with 26 signatures objecting to this planning application, because of their concerns about inadequate information, overlooking, poor design and harm to the Greenway Conservation Area.</i></p> <p><i>This followed the unlawful construction of a very large conservatory extension built without planning permission when work was done at all hours and without consideration for the neighbours. Enforcement were notified, but did not keep us updated or take action, leaving us in limbo. After the planning application and our petition, we made enquiries and had no response from planning until our local councillor got involved. This was worrying as we thought no-one was listening.</i></p> <p><i>It is welcome that the plans now show the conservatory extension has now been removed and changes have been made to the façade (thanks to officers). However, there are still concerns that:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>• the property is too wide (far in excess of current policy) creating a terracing effect contrary to the character of the road.</i> <i>• that the property will be too large to be much needed family accommodation and will default to being an HMO (noting that the proposal would include more building at two storeys than No.12 and already includes an irregular full 3rd storey on the outrigger).</i> <i>• That the proposal does not step back at ground floor. This is a different building to No.12 with a different entrance location providing</i>

different design challenges. Brick matching etc.

This application illustrates the concern local people have over recent developments in the Greenway Conservation Area and the pressing need for a conservation area appraisal which would identify what is significant and protect the things that contribute to character. For example,

- Walls and gardens at the front of properties (already lost in this case) so that front gardens contribute towards green space and attenuation and do not just become parking lots.*
- The spacing between houses (which would be lost between number 10 and 12 (Not a pair as stated, but different houses)).*

There is much to protect in the Greenway Conservation Area with its unique history and its development, described to some extent in the Hillingdon Townscape study. We believe that a conservation area appraisal would assist officers, save their time and preserve the valuable and valued asset of the Greenway Conservation Area.

A written representation from the Councillor Tony Burles as Ward Councillor was read out:

Apologies for not being there in person tonight but I would like to make a couple of comments on the above application 77809/APP/2023/1129.

I fully support the residents in opposition to this application. The residents and I appreciate the hard work put in by the planning team in negotiating conditions with the applicant in particular over the removal of the conservatory and some better detailing on the front facade.

However, the property as proposed is too wide (far in excess of current policy) creating a terracing effect contrary to the character of the road.

The worry that the property is too large to be family accommodation and will end up as another HMO in the Greenway Conservation area.

On the subject of the conservation area this application illustrates the concerns local people have over recent developments and presses the need for a conservation area appraisal.

There was an Article 4 Direction applicable to this site, which removed permitted development rights to turn the property into an HMO without planning permission.

There would be a separation distance of 1.25 meters from the boundary so that there would not be a terracing impact. This was consistent with the street scene.

Members asked about sufficient of parking. Officers noted that the development would provide two car parking spaces. The London Plan standard would be 1.75 so two car parking spaces was the maximum policy would allow.

Members discussed the width and depth of the property in comparison to others on the street.

Officers' recommendations were moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, agreed.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved as per officer's recommendations

24. **MINOR APP: 45 FRAYS AVENUE - 24351/APP/2023/2135** (*Agenda Item 11*)

Demolition of existing bungalow and erection of two storey, 4-bed detached dwelling with habitable roof space (incorporating a rear dormer and front/side roof lights), parking and amenity space and installation of vehicular crossover to front. Renewal of expired planning consent under reference 24351/APP/2016/1304.

Officers introduced the application, noting the addendum, which amended a condition to improve air quality.

The lead petitioner addressed the Committee and made the following points:

- *The petitioner did not want to prevent development of the plot.*
- *Neighbourhood stability was sought, rather than an HMO.*
- *Overdevelopment would lead to irreversible consequences of loss of privacy, natural light and scenic viewpoint.*
- *Many other neighbours would suffer as well.*
- *A key issue was constructing what was, in all but name, a six-bedroom three-story building which would stretch the building line beyond reasonable limits. This in itself would not impact number 43 so devastatingly if the proposed new front building line were able to be brought forward to compensate.*
- *The back of the petitioner's property and patio would be overshadowed by the proposed structure.*
- *Why has the front build line of the existing structure not been able to be retained?*
- *It was uncertain as to where the 45-degree visibility angle from number 43 has been measured from.*
- *There was already variation in the building line of the petitioner's side of the road.*
- *The report mentions possible negative impact on other neighbour's properties, but not the petitioner's property.*
- *The comments from West Drayton Conservation Area panel stated this application "will take light from the rear of number 43 and will have an overbearing effect on the properties on both sides".*
- *The planning officer's comments section stated that there was no kitchen extractor shown on the proposed plans when in fact an extract system was shown on some drawings as blowing directly onto the petitioner's patio.*
- *The height of 8.41 meters would tower far above the petitioner's property which was 6.4 meters at maximum.*

The applicant addressed the Committee and made the following points:

- *This application had been previously approved via a pre-planning application, with lots of contact with planning officers.*
- *No changes had been made.*
- *This was the same application.*

A condition was added to require corrected plans to be submitted prior to commencement, given an error in the drawings pertaining to a staircase.

A condition was added to remove permitted development rights for change of use to a small HMO.

Members questioned and officers clarified that while the application was identical to the previous one, the policy framework had been updated, and considering physical context and the impact on neighbouring properties, any substantial changes could appear unreasonable and might not withstand an appeal. Officers acknowledged the limitations in changing the plans due to the expiration of the determination and the necessity to assess the application based on the current development plan.

When this application was approved previously, the Council did impose a condition restricting the height of the building. That was taken to appeal and the Council lost so that condition was found to be not necessary or reasonable.

On the petitioner's point about the extractor fan outlet, officers noted that this was not something that would usually be taking into account as no planning permission is needed for an extractor fan outlet. Furthermore, the planning inspector may find control of this unreasonable.

In terms of impact on neighbouring properties, officers clarified that at the moment in the area, there were a lot of two storey properties that already had either rear first floor windows or rear dormer windows and those windows provided views into the gardens of neighbours as well as the garden of the host dwelling. For that reason, putting in a dormer at the back would likely give the same view as those existing windows in the area so there would be no uplift in privacy loss or overlooking. A condition had been added to restrict the insertion of any other first floor side windows which would cause privacy issues. In addition to that, it was ensured that the side windows which were being proposed were going to be obscure glazed.

Officers' recommendations were moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved as per officer's recommendations

25. **MAJOR APP: LORD ADONIS HOUSE, HAREFIELD ACADEMY, NORTHWOOD WAY - 17709/APP/2023/2673** (*Agenda Item 12*)

Demolition of former residential school and erection of academic building (Use Class F1) and ancillary structures including heat pump and substation enclosures, construction of a multi-use games area, revised vehicular access, landscaping, car and cycle parking and associated works.

Officers introduced the application, noting the addendum, which amended a condition to improve air quality.

Members asked about sustainable water management. Officers noted that the application did submit a drainage strategy as part of the application. This was written in accordance with Local Plan/ London Plan requirements that there be sustainable drainage measures proposed. There would be increased soft landscaping and attenuation as part of the proposals including a green roof and officers considered this to be acceptable subject to a planning condition which was listed under condition 14. This would secure the final detail of any such drainage strategy.

	<p>Members asked about the green belt and its footprint. Officers clarified that there was an increased footprint. There was an increased volume which was equal to approximately 50% volume but there was a sufficient decrease in height, equal to 3.3 meters.</p> <p>Members asked about urban design. The Urban Design officer did raise concerns over the general approach of the design but one of the main things to consider was officers had already seen what was essentially the same proposal previously, and it had been approved at Committee back in July 2022 and approved this year formally in 2023 so it would not be reasonable to seek further amendments as part of this application proposal.</p> <p>Members acknowledged the urgent need for new SEN places at secondary level.</p> <p>Concerns about external lighting were addressed with specific conditions to minimise light pollution. Additionally, the plan's focus on energy self-sufficiency was highlighted, indicating an energy net positive provision secured by conditions and a legal agreement.</p> <p>Officers' recommendations were moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the application be approved as per officer's recommendations</p>
26.	<p>MAJOR APP: HAYES BRIDGE RETAIL PARK, UXBRIDGE ROAD - 1911/APP/2022/1853 (<i>Agenda Item 13</i>)</p> <p>Demolition of existing buildings and erection of a single commercial building for employment purposes Class E(g)iii, B2 and B8, along with ancillary offices, gatehouse, associated infrastructure including; service yard, car parking, drainage and hard and soft landscaping.</p> <p>Officers presented the application, noting an addendum related to a pollution-absorbing tree planting condition amendment.</p> <p>Members asked about the road layout. Officers clarified that there would be only alterations made to the lane arrangement within the site. At present there were two lanes coming out of the site and as part of the proposals that would be reduced to one lane. This was viewed favourably by Highways officers because it would reduce the potential for conflict between vehicles at this junction.</p> <p>Members noted that it was a positive to have someone want to take on the unit. This application would provide jobs and boost the local economy.</p> <p>Officers' recommendations were moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the application be approved as per officer's recommendations</p>
27.	<p>MAJOR APP: LAND AT AINSCOUGH CRANES, UNIT 84, HAYES INDUSTRIAL PARK - 63099/APP/2023/1608 (<i>Agenda Item 14</i>)</p> <p>The demolition of existing structures and redevelopment for Use Classes</p>

	<p>E(g)(iii), B2 and B8 (applied flexibly) including hard and soft landscaping, servicing and associated works.</p> <p>Officers introduced the application, noting the addendum which highlighted amended conditions.</p> <p>Members commended a good investment – it was pleasing that businesses wanted to invest in Hillingdon.</p> <p>Officers’ recommendations were moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the application be approved as per officer’s recommendations</p>
28.	<p>MINOR APP: NORTHWOOD HILL LIBRARY, POTTER STREET - 8915/APP/2023/2709 (<i>Agenda Item 15</i>)</p> <p>Demolition of existing library and construction of a new mixed-use building comprising a replacement library and 9 x residential dwellings with car parking, cycle parking, waste storage and associated infrastructure</p> <p>Officers introduced the application, noting the addendum which amended conditions to ensure a policy compliant level of car parking was provided, and to improve air quality.</p> <p>Members expressed support for investing in new library facilities, emphasising the public benefits and the prospect of creating additional housing.</p> <p>Members raised a query about the parking provisions, which were clarified to prioritise parking allocation for the three-bedroom family units via specific conditions. It was anticipated that people visiting the library would likely already be in the town centre and so would not generate single purpose trips.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the application be approved as per officer’s recommendations</p>
29.	<p>MINOR APP: CIVIC CENTRE, HIGH STREET, UXBRIDGE - 14805/APP/2023/3035 (<i>Agenda Item 16</i>)</p> <p>Installation of 2no. Air Source Heat Pumps (ASHPs) on the cooling tower roof, 1no. ASHP on the chimney roof with one thermal buffer, and 4no. ASHPS within the service yard surrounded by a 2.1m high, red metal louvre fencing and one thermal buffer. Replacement of existing timber beams and roof covering of the cooling tower roof. Installation of 9 steel beams to reinforce the existing steel frame in the plant room beneath the roof. On the chimney roof, the paving slabs and stilts will be removed to offset the load of the ASHP and thermal buffer on the supporting roof structure.</p> <p>Items 16 and 17 were presented together.</p> <p>Officers introduced the application.</p> <p>Members noted that bringing the Civic Centre up to a more environmentally friendly standard was critically important.</p>

	<p>Officers' recommendations were moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the application be approved as per officer's recommendations</p>
30.	<p>MINOR APP: CIVIC CENTRE, HIGH STREET, UXBRIDGE - 14805/APP/2023/3037 <i>(Agenda Item 17)</i></p> <p>Installation of 2no. Air Source Heat Pumps (ASHPs) on the cooling tower roof, 1no. ASHP on the chimney roof with one thermal buffer, and 4no. ASHPS within the service yard surrounded by a 2.1m high, red metal louvre fencing and one thermal buffer. Replacement of existing timber beams and roof covering of the cooling tower roof. Installation of 9 steel beams to reinforce the existing steel frame in the plant room beneath the roof. On the chimney roof, the paving slabs and stilts will be removed to offset the load of the ASHP and thermal buffer on the supporting roof structure. Installation of secondary glazing and cavity wall insulation.</p> <p>Items 16 and 17 were presented together.</p> <p>Officers' recommendations were moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the application be approved as per officer's recommendations</p>
	<p>The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 9.35 pm.</p>

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Ryan Dell at democratic@hillingdon.gov.uk. Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.