

## Minutes

### HILLINGDON PLANNING COMMITTEE

17 January 2024

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



HILLINGDON  
LONDON

	<p><b>Committee Members Present:</b> Councillors Roy Chamdal, Darran Davies, Elizabeth Garelick, Henry Higgins (Chair), Gursharan Mand, Jagjit Singh and Peter Smallwood (in place of Adam Bennett)</p> <p><b>LBH Officers Present:</b> Roz Johnson – Head of Development Management and Building Control Katie Crosbie – Area Planning Service Manager Chris Brady – Planning Team Leader Christos Chrysanthou – Planning Officer Richard Phillips – Principal Planning Officer Dr Alan Tilly – Transport Planning and Development Team Manager Natalie Fairclough – Legal Advisor Jimmy Walsh – Legal Advisor Anisha Teji – Democratic Services Officer</p>
31.	<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Adam Bennett with Councillor Peter Smallwood substituting.</p>
32.	<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>
33.	<p><b>TO RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING</b> (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b> That the minutes from the meeting on 6 December 2023 be approved.</p>
34.	<p><b>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
35.	<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 would be heard in Part I.</p>
36.	<p><b>28 JACKS LANE, HAREFIELD - 76265/APP/2023/1128</b> (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p>

## **Alterations of garage roof, erection of a three-storey side extension with balcony and balustrade, alterations to fenestration, and demolition of chimney**

Officers introduced the application, highlighted the addendum and made a recommendation for approval.

A petitioner in objection to the proposed development addressed the Committee and referred to slides that were circulated to Members and officers prior to the meeting. A background of the application was provided, and this was the third time the petitioner had addressed the Committee. It was submitted that the proposed development caused irreversible harm to the character of the area, overbearing issues and breached the 45-degree angle. Significant concerns were raised about the application facilitating the use of the property as a future house in multiple occupancy (HMO) or hotel. It was questioned why the 45-degree breach had been accepted in this application as it was understood to go against guidelines. It was further submitted that the Planning Inspector's decision had been dismissed by officers and there had been a disregard for the petitioner's living conditions. It was submitted that the Planning Inspector had raised concerns regarding the extension's height, bulk and proximity, indicating that it would impact the outlook of the office window creating a sense of enclosure. It was further alleged that the house had hardly been occupied since 2022. The petitioner strongly objected to the application and asked for the planning application to be refused.

The applicant addressed the Committee and strongly objected to the assertion that the property would be used as a hotel or an HMO. The applicant stated that the house was and would continue to be used as a family home, and a history of the application was provided. It was submitted that although many residents objected to the application there were also residents that supported the application. It was submitted that there was still more than enough room to build on the site plot without obstructing views of the canal. Existing privacy and overlooking concerns were alleged in respect of the applicant's back garden. The applicant stated that the application had been made to accommodate a family unit and it was submitted that the Planning Inspector had indicated that the neighbouring property would be barely impacted by scheme. It was further submitted that the scheme would provide more privacy by removing the existing upstairs side elevation window. The applicant stated that they had compromised in the proposal, and it was submitted that his family was being denied the opportunity to improve their living space.

Councillor Martin Goddard addressed the Committee and supported the points raised by the petitioner. The Chairman exercised his discretion in allowing Councillor Goddard to address the Committee in Ward Councillor Jane Palmer's absence due to personal circumstances and the fact that the property was located on the border of Ickenham and Harefield. It was highlighted that the meeting in October 2023 was adjourned to verify whether the 45-degree angle had been breached. Although it was confirmed that there was a breach, it was submitted that planning officers were now saying that this was an irrelevant consideration. It was submitted that the points raised by the Planning Inspector had been consistently dismissed by officers. It was further alleged that the petitioner had compiled data to show that the applicant did not live in the property and it was not being used as a family dwelling.

Prior to Member discussions the Head of Development and Build Control clarified a number of points for the Committee relating to character, design, the impact on the conservation area and the Planning Inspector's decision. It was acknowledged that this

was an emotive application for both the petitioner and applicant. The application for the Committee's consideration was for the householder extension and this was the key consideration. Extracts from the Planning Inspector's decision notice were read verbatim to the Committee. It was acknowledged that the 45-degree guideline, typically applied for front or rear extensions, was breached by a relatively small margin. However, the Committee was advised that this was just a guideline and emphasised the importance of considering whether the proposal was harmful to residential amenity overall. Members were informed that there was adequate separation between the window and the proposed extension, minimising any detrimental impacts to the neighbouring property. A condition could be added to prevent the change of use to an HMO without planning permission to alleviate some of the concerns raised in this respect.

Members sought clarification on whether windows had been removed and replaced at the neighbouring property. It was confirmed that an obscure window film had been removed from the ground floor office window and staircase window since the previous application. It was explained that a daylight and sun light assessment had not been undertaken as officers were content that the revised scheme was acceptable.

During Member discussion, it was noted that the exact measurement for the 45-degree angle was not included in the report. The Committee was informed that to provide the most accurate measurement, an independent surveyor would need to be instructed and this was not considered proportionate or necessary. Although the 45-degree angle guideline had been breached, the impact was acceptable and a Member and officer site visit was undertaken in order to enable assessment of this.

The Legal Advisor asked the Committee to only consider material planning considerations when making its decision.

The Committee agreed that it would be sensible to include a condition preventing the change of use to an HMO. The petitioner concerns were acknowledged however there was a concern that if this went to a planning appeal and was allowed, then there would be no opportunity to impose conditions.

Due to the concerns raised, Members suggested that the proposed balcony privacy screen be obscure glazed glass with a continuous height of 1.8m to increase privacy for neighbouring properties.

The officers' recommendation, inclusive of a new condition to prevent the use of an HMO, hotel or Air BnB, amendment to condition 6 (balcony privacy screen details) to ensure the obscure glass screen was 1.8m high for its full length, was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, there were six votes in favour and one abstention.

**RESOLVED: That the application be approved as per officer recommendation subject to a new condition to prevent the use of an HMO, hotel or air BnB, and an amendment to Condition 6 (balcony privacy screen details). The condition wording being subject to approval by the Chair.**

37. **4 CHURCH LANE, UXBRIDGE - 77634/APP/2023/2012** (*Agenda Item 7*)

**Erection of a two-storey side extension, front porch, single storey rear extension and conversion of roof space to habitable use to include a rear dormer extension**

Officers introduced the application, highlighted the addendum and made a recommendation for approval.

A petitioner in objection of the proposed development addressed the Committee and raised concerns about the potential use of the property. It was submitted that a range of people had lived in the property over a period of time and it was being advertised on rent a room. The recommendation that the property was not used as a house of multiple occupancy was welcomed. Church Lane was a community family area and changing the property use would change the nature of the property and community. It was submitted that based on the layout of the property and number of bathrooms there was no intention to use the property as a family home and questions were raised on how the HMO stipulation would be policed. The petitioner welcomed a new family into the community but was concerned about the possibility of the property being used as an HMO in the future.

The applicant for the application addressed the Committee and outlined the proposal. A background and context was provided for the reasons for the application and it was confirmed that the proposed extension was to accommodate the family needs. The applicant largely agreed with the officers' report and welcomed any conditions. The applicant welcomed the condition in relation to the prevention of an HMO. The proposal had been designed by a professional architect and there was offsite parking available for the house. The applicant was shocked by the allegations of using the property for renting purposes, however it was confirmed that it was not necessary to address those allegations as they would not be considered by the Committee.

In response to Member questions regarding the change of use of the property, the applicant confirmed that there were no plans to convert the property to an HMO and it would be used as a family dwelling. The applicant confirmed that an inspection visit was undertaken two hours after receiving notice.

Councillor Tony Burles, Ward Councillor for Uxbridge made written submissions to the Committee supporting the points raised by the petitioner. It was noted that the property had been operating as an HMO which had impacted the nature and quietness of the road. Approving the application would make the situation worse for residents as there were already parking issues on the road. A site visit was requested.

The Head of Development Management and Building Control drew the Committee's attention to the addendum that provided details from a site inspection undertaken by a Planning Manager. It was noted that the site inspection did not substantiate allegations that the property is in use as a House in Multiple Occupation. However, the matter remains under investigation by the Council's Planning and Housing Departments. The Committee was urged to consider the application before it and not any potential change of use of the property. The Legal Advisor advised the Committee that whether the property was an HMO was background information and any breaches would be considered by the Council enforcement team.

During Member discussions it was noted that a construction management plan condition was not recommended due to the size and scale of the development. An informative could be added in respect of working hours to limit any noise impact.

Members were pleased to see the petitioner and applicant working together to address the issues raised and for the applicant to accept any conditions put forward.

The officer's recommendation, inclusive of an informative regarding working hours, was

	<p>moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, was unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED: That the application be approved as per officer recommendation subject to the informative regarding working hours and the additional information in the addendum.</b></p>
38.	<p><b>10 OAKWOOD ROAD, PINNER - 36748/APP/2023/2176</b> (<i>Agenda Item 8</i>)</p> <p><b>Demolition of existing 2-bedroom detached bungalow and erection of a two-storey purpose built flat development comprising of 2 x 1-bed self-contained flats and 2 x 2-bed self-contained flats with associated parking, cycle storage, refuse storage and private amenity.</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the application and made a recommendation for refusal.</p> <p>A petitioner in objection of the proposed development addressed the Committee. The planning officers' report in recommending refusal of the application was welcomed as the development would be overbearing and incongruous. The development would not blend with other properties on the road and would require the demolition of a good family home. Although alterations had been made to the application, it was submitted that these were negligible and insufficient evidence had been provided in respect of the roof elevation. Concerns were also raised about the impact the proposed development would have on traffic and parking. It was submitted that the area was already used often for commuter parking, dumped cars and there were some concerns regarding safety due to the way vehicles had been parked. It was further submitted that there would be a huge loss of privacy, the proposal would be overbearing, cause a loss of air quality and an increase in noise. The Committee was asked to refuse the application.</p> <p>The Area Planning Service Manager advised the Committee that there were no Highway objections to the proposed development.</p> <p>The Committee endorsed the refusal reasons in the report.</p> <p>The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, was unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED: That the application be refused as per officer's recommendation.</b></p>
39.	<p><b>BERRITE INDUSTRIAL ESTATE, IRON BRIDGE ROAD - 45237/APP/2022/3398</b> (<i>Agenda Item 9</i>)</p> <p><b>Redevelopment of the site to provide 3 no. replacement industrial units (Use Class E(g) (iii), B2 and/or B8 uses), surface level car parking and associated works (works involve demolition of existing Units 6, 7 and 8).</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the application, highlighted the addendum and made a recommendation for approval subject to completion of a S106 legal agreement.</p> <p>The Committee was encouraged to see that the developer had worked with the Canal and River trust to overcome issues of overshadowing. Members requested that the inclusion of wheel washing be specified as part of the Construction Management Plan.</p> <p>The officer's recommendation, was moved, seconded and unanimously agreed.</p>

	<p><b>RESOLVED: That the application be approved subject to the completion of the S106 as per officer's recommendation, and subject to the inclusion of wheel washing in the Construction Management Plan.</b></p>
40.	<p><b>THE BUNGALOW, NEW YEARS GREEN LANE - 29665/APP/2022/2534</b> (<i>Agenda Item 10</i>)</p> <p><b>Demolition of existing bungalow, all stable structures and outbuildings. Erection of staff facilities, recycling stalls and recladding of the existing barn. Widening of the vehicular access, formation of link access to Civic Amenity site, installation of new boundary fence, gates and associated external works.</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the application and made a recommendation for approval.</p> <p>The Committee considered this application to be a good scheme. In response to clarification questions regarding flood risks and highways, it was confirmed that condition 16 required the submission of a sustainable water management plan. It was also explained that the proposed scheme included widening the entrance so that it was safer for vehicles to access.</p> <p>The officer's recommendation, was moved, seconded and unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED: That the application be approved as per officer's recommendation.</b></p>
41.	<p><b>HILLINGDON SPORTS AND LEISURE CENTRE - 2543/APP/2023/2972</b> (<i>Agenda Item 11</i>)</p> <p><b>Installation of 526 photovoltaic panels to the roof of the building. Installation of 4no ASHP evaporator units on raised frame, 1no thermal store, 1no ASHP compressor unit to the south of the site with associated landscaping including increased height of grassed mound by 1m and 2.4m high green Paladin security fencing. Installation of 1no ASHP unit and thermal store adjacent to the Idris track club building, surrounded by 2.4m high green Paladin security fencing (revised plans and description)</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the application and made a recommendation for approval.</p> <p>Although the Committee was mindful that this development was on the greenbelt, it welcomed the officers report that negated any potential harm.</p> <p>The officer's recommendation, was moved, seconded and unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED: That the application be approved as per officer's recommendation.</b></p>
42.	<p><b>HILLINGDON SPORTS AND LEISURE CENTRE - 2543/APP/2023/2973 (LBC)</b> (<i>Agenda Item 12</i>)</p> <p><b>Installation of 526 photovoltaic panels to the roof of the main building (in connection with full planning application ref: 2543/APP/2023/2972)</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the application and made a recommendation to approve listed building consent. This application was presented concurrently with the associated</p>

	<p>application for planning permission.</p> <p>The officer's recommendation, was moved, seconded and unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED: That the application be approved as per officer's recommendation.</b></p>
43.	<p><b>WINSTON CHURCHILL HALL, PIN WAY - 78327/APP/2023/2901</b> (<i>Agenda Item 13</i>)</p> <p><b>Installation of three air source heat pumps (ASHPs) at ground level on the southern elevation enclosed by 1.9m high fencing and additional planting. Replacement of existing windows with double glazing. Installation of 97 PV panels on the roof, installation of a trench required for low voltage cable connection under footpath and installation of cavity wall insulation.</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the application, highlighted the addendum and made a recommendation for approval.</p> <p>Further to Committee clarification request, officers confirmed that following publication of the committee report further information had been submitted in relation to window details. The submissions had been reviewed and were considered acceptable by the Council's Conservation officer.</p> <p>The officer's recommendation, was moved, seconded and unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED: That the application be approved as per officer's recommendation subject to the amendments to the conditions as listed in the addendum.</b></p>
44.	<p><b>HIGHGROVE SWIMMING POOL - 26404/APP/2023/2974</b> (<i>Agenda Item 14</i>)</p> <p><b>Installation of 358 Photovoltaic panels to the roof of the building. 3no. air source heat pumps within the Northeast corner of the car park, and 2.4m high green paladin security fencing. 2no. substations and 1no. switchroom within Glass reinforced plastic (GRP)enclosures. Replacement windows (revised description, revised plans and additional plans)</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the application, highlighted the addendum and made a recommendation for approval.</p> <p>Further to Committee clarification request, officers confirmed that there were a total of 124 car parking spaces and there would be a loss of 10 spaces. Any potential overspill would be mitigated by the parking control measures on the roads near the proposed development.</p> <p>The officer's recommendation, was moved, seconded and unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED: That the application be approved as per officer's recommendation subject to the additional condition listed in the addendum.</b></p>
	<p>The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 9.16 pm.</p>

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the

---

resolutions please contact Anisha Teji on 01895 277655 or [ateji@hillington.gov.uk](mailto:ateji@hillington.gov.uk).  
Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the  
Public.