

Minutes

HILLINGDON PLANNING COMMITTEE

2 October 2025

Meeting held at Committee Room 5 - Civic Centre



	<p>Committee Members Present: Councillors Henry Higgins (Chair) Adam Bennett (Vice-Chair) Roy Chamdal Darran Davies Elizabeth Garelick Jagjit Singh</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: Chris Brady, Planning Team Leader Michael Briginshaw, Deputy Team Leader Katie Crosbie, Area Planning Service Manager Natalie Fairclough, Legal Advisor Michael Kemp, Deputy Team Leader Ed Laughton, Area Planning Service Manager Liz Penny, Democratic Services Officer Dr Alan Tilly, Transport Planning and Development Team Manager</p>
87.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Raju Sansarpuri and from Councillor Keith Burrows with Councillor Darran Davies substituting for the latter.</p>
88.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>Councillor Roy Chamdal declared a non-pecuniary interest in item 6 (5 The Meads) as he had previously spoken with the applicant. He left the meeting prior to this matter being discussed and did not partake in the voting on this item.</p>
89.	<p>TO RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting dated 04 September 2025 be agreed as an accurate record.</p>
90.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
91.	<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>

	It was confirmed that all items of business were marked Part I and would be considered in public.
92.	<p>5 THE MEADS, COWLEY - 27254/APP/2025/1529 (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p>Erection of a single storey rear extension and double storey side extensions to both sides of property following the demolition of existing garage and removal of two chimney stacks (amended description)</p> <p>Councillor Roy Chamdal had expressed a non-pecuniary interest in the application therefore left the room and did not participate in the debate or voting for this item.</p> <p>Officers introduced the application noting that the site lay within conservation areas and an Article 4 zone, which restricted permitted development rights for small HMOs. Members heard that the design complied with Council policy, being subordinate and well-scaled, and similar extensions existed nearby. A daylight and sunlight report confirmed no significant impact on neighbouring habitable rooms, particularly at No. 7, whose windows faced the proposed development. Planning officers supported the application as it aligned with design and amenity policies, and it was recommended for approval.</p> <p>A petition had been received in objection to the application. The lead petitioner was present and addressed the Committee Members highlighting the following key points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residents at number 7 had expressed concerns that the initial plans resembled an HMO-style property, which would not be in keeping with the street's character. • They noted that the applicant was a property developer and believed the design was squeezed between neighbouring homes. • The planning report was criticised for focusing solely on number 2 The Meads, which was not a fair or representative comparison due to its unique location and spacious surroundings. • It was highlighted that only one of eight properties had double-storey extensions on both sides, making number 2 an outlier. • The proposed application site, was located at the bottom of the close with neighbours on both sides, including number 7, which faced it directly at a 90° angle. • Concerns were raised about the impact on light and shadowing, with reported losses of 10% in the office and 7% in the bedroom at number 7. • The proposal was said to disregard Council policy requiring detached houses to be set back at least one metre. • Number 4 was cited as a better example of considerate planning, being set three metres back and fitting the street's character. • Doubts were expressed about the credibility of the daylight and sunlight report, citing inconsistent data and lack of professional accreditation. • A request was made for the Council to consider safeguards against future HMO or subletting developments and to review the proposal for partial approval due to its impact on number 7. • Visual representations were used to argue that the proposed development would appear as an oversized block squeezed into a small space, disrupting the street scene. <p>Members sought further clarification from the petitioners regarding shadowing and the</p>

impact of the proposal on daylight and sunlight at their property. The petitioner acknowledged that shadowing already occurred due to the existing structure and argued that adding a double-storey extension would worsen it, potentially covering most of their house. While they appreciated the neighbour's intent to improve their property, they felt the proposed development was unfair and inconsistent with the typical single two-storey extensions seen on the street. The petitioners emphasised their unique situation, with their house directly facing the neighbour's wall, and feared the extension would significantly degrade their living experience.

The applicant was also in attendance and addressed the Committee Members. Key points highlighted included:

- Petitioners at number 7 had misled others by claiming the planning application was for an HMO, when it was actually for a family home.
- The house was intended for the use of the applicant's own family, which included his four sons and a spouse, therefore five bedrooms were needed.
- It was explained that the downstairs room had mistakenly been labelled as a bedroom by the architect, but it was actually an office, with a gym on the left side.
- The applicant stated that the neighbour's shadowing photo was misleading and argued that the actual distance between the properties was nine metres, which would not significantly affect light or privacy.
- He emphasised that the proposed extension was a single-storey addition and complied with planning regulations, including no windows facing the neighbour.
- The applicant claimed that the neighbour had labelled him a property developer which was untrue.
- He noted that officers had no objections to the proposal and that the application adhered to all planning rules and regulations.
- The applicant felt it would have been better if the neighbour had approached him directly to discuss concerns.

Ward Councillor Ahmad-Wallana was also present and addressed the Committee in support of petitioners. Councillor Ahmad-Wallana objected to the planning application, citing its negative impact on the neighbouring property at number 7. He argued that the proposed two-storey side extension would significantly reduce natural light to side-facing windows and garden areas, causing substantial overshadowing and harming the living conditions of the occupants at number 7. It was claimed that the development would breach guidance on daylight and sunlight and would create an oppressive environment. The scale and positioning of the extension were described as overbearing, reducing the sense of openness and disrupting the visual character of the street. The proposal was also considered inconsistent with local planning policies, and Councillor Ahmad-Wallana requested that the Committee refuse the application.

Officers acknowledged the petitioner's photo submissions but noted that they lacked professional accuracy compared to the validated planning documents. It was emphasised that the daylight and sunlight assessment had been conducted by a qualified consultancy, adhering to BRE guidance, and had found no significant impact on neighbouring properties. The proposed extensions were deemed domestically scaled and compliant with design policy DM HD1, with limited visual intrusion. Although the proximity to property number 7 was noted, it was clarified that existing overshadowing and vegetation already affected light levels. The report was considered robust, and there were no grounds to refuse the application on the grounds of harm to residential amenity. Additionally, officers clarified that the site was within an Article 4

	<p>area, hence any conversion to an HMO would require planning consent and public consultation.</p> <p>In response to Members' questions, it was explained that, since the property was located in an Article 4 area, the usual rule allowing up to six bedrooms without planning permission for an HMO did not apply. This meant that even if the property had fewer than six bedrooms, it still could not be converted into an HMO without submitting a planning application.</p> <p>Councillors raised concerns regarding the daylight and sunlight impact of the proposed development on neighbouring property number 7 and asked how many hours of direct sunlight the affected rooms received during winter and how the extension would alter that. Officers responded that the assessment followed BRE guidance using percentage-based metrics rather than direct sunlight hours and confirmed the development did not breach the 27% threshold for significant impact.</p> <p>Members sought clarification on amendments to the daylight and sunlight report, questioning whether they were limited to typos or included changes to figures. It was explained that the amendments addressed drafting errors, such as references to unbuilt extensions, and confirmed the report was updated for transparency without affecting its conclusions.</p> <p>A further question was raised about the relevance of the petitioner's photos, to which officers responded that while the photos illustrated existing overshadowing, the proposed extension would be slightly lower and only 3 metres closer, resulting in minimal additional harm. Officers also noted that the affected windows were part of an existing extension, which already experienced overshadowing.</p> <p>Finally, the Committee asked whether scaffolding restrictions should be considered due to the proximity of the neighbouring property. Officers clarified that construction must remain within the applicant's boundary and that such restrictions were not typically imposed for household applications.</p> <p>Councillors acknowledged the petitioner's concerns about the potential use of the property as an HMO and appreciated that this issue had been clarified by officers, noting that any future conversion would require Planning approval. They noted that the proposal was consistent with the character of the area and unlikely to be successfully challenged on appeal.</p> <p>Members raised no further concerns or questions. The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously approved.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the application be approved subject to conditions as set out in the officer's report.</p>
93.	<p>HAYES BRIDGE RETAIL PARK AND HEATHROW INTERCHANGE, UXBRIDGE ROAD - 78343/APP/2025/719 (<i>Agenda Item 7</i>)</p> <p>This hybrid planning application seeks permission for a four-phased redevelopment to deliver a data centre campus comprising: Full planning permission for a data centre building and associated infrastructure/works (Phase 1); Outline planning permission for an Innovation Hub and infrastructure/works (Phase 2); Outline planning permission for a data centre building and associated</p>

infrastructure/works (Phase 3); and Outline planning permission for a data centre building and associated infrastructure/works (Phase 4). All matters are reserved for the Outline phases of development.

Officers introduced the application for redevelopment of Hayes Bridge Retail Park and Heathrow Interchange and highlighted the additional information in the addendum. The application involved the demolition of existing buildings and construction of three data centres and an innovation hub. It was noted that Phase 1 sought full planning permission for the LON 6 data centre, while Phases 2–4 sought outline planning permission for the remaining elements of development. The innovation hub was designed as affordable workspace for SMEs and community use. Officers confirmed that the proposal was an appropriate use for the Strategic Industrial Location, would not overburden the power grid, offered economic benefits and complied with the emerging character of the area. The environmental impacts posed by the development would be mitigated by the planning conditions and obligations recommended. The application was recommended for approval, subject to conditions and legal agreements.

Councillors supported the proposal to redevelop unused land and requested that each phase of the multi-phase application be brought back to Committee for approval. Officers confirmed that all reserved matters applications would return to Committee.

The Committee raised questions about securing peppercorn rents for the innovation hub, and officers clarified that this would be enforced through the Section 106 agreement and lease terms.

Councillors queried the relatively low financial contributions compared to a similar data centre in Abbots Langley; in response, it was noted that the on-site innovation hub offered direct community benefits, making it a preferable alternative.

Concerns about Wi-Fi impact were raised, with suggestions for conditions or informatives to ensure local connectivity was not compromised. Officers noted that digital infrastructure was addressed in the London Plan policy and confirmed ducting for full fibre would be included. The Legal Advisor explained that a planning condition on Wi-Fi would not meet the six-part test but supported the addition of an informative. It was agreed that said informative would be drafted by officers in consultation with the Chair.

The Committee urged timely progress to avoid delays seen in previous approvals. No further queries or concerns were raised.

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

RESOLVED:

- 1. That the application be approved subject to a section 106 legal agreement and the conditions set out in the officer's report; and**
- 2. That the drafting of an additional informative to ensure local Wi-Fi connectivity was not compromised be delegated to the Area Planning Service Manager, in consultation with the Chair.**

94.	<p>MEAD HOUSE, HAYES - 12298/APP/2025/1001 (<i>Agenda Item 8</i>)</p> <p>Change of use from health care use to supported living accommodation (Use Class C2) with ancillary offices and facilities</p> <p>Officers introduced the application which proposed changing the use of Mead House from a healthcare facility to supported living accommodation (Class C2) for adults with learning disabilities. It was confirmed that the building had previously served as a hostel and had been decommissioned by the NHS in 2023. It was noted that the change of use would not conflict with Green Belt or heritage policies, as the site lay within the Green Belt and near Grade II listed buildings. Members were informed that minimal physical changes were proposed, including a reduction in parking spaces from 32 to 8, with low anticipated vehicle movements. All trees on site, protected by TPOs, were to be retained. Officers noted that the loss of the healthcare use was deemed to be acceptable, as services had been relocated elsewhere in the Borough. The proposal aligned with local and London Plan policies and a Section 106 agreement would secure management and safeguarding arrangements. Officers recommended approval subject to completion of the legal agreement.</p> <p>Councillors sought assurances that the property, currently classified as C2, could not be converted into a C4 HMO without planning permission. It was confirmed that any change of use would require formal approval and that the C2 classification would be secured through a legal agreement.</p> <p>Members queried whether the accommodation would be for all ages or specifically for young people, and officers clarified it would be for adults aged 18 and over.</p> <p>Concerns about parking were addressed by officers, who explained that a travel plan would be required and that the reduced parking provision was appropriate given the expected low demand. The presence of a turning circle for coaches was also noted.</p> <p>Councillors expressed support for the reuse of the building, noting its previous use as a residential institution and COVID testing site, and welcomed the minimal changes proposed, which satisfied Green Belt policy.</p> <p>Members raised no further concerns or queries. The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded, and, when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the application be approved.</p>
95.	<p>COMAG, YIEWSLEY - 24843/APP/2024/2316 (<i>Agenda Item 9</i>)</p> <p>Variation of Conditions 2 (Approved Plans) and 3 (Approved Documents) of planning permission reference 24843/APP/2022/2403, dated 11-06-2024</p> <p>Officers introduced the application for the COMAG site which proposed a Section 73 variation to conditions 2 and 3 of a previously approved planning permission, aiming to update the approved plans and documents. Members heard that the extension was minimal in scale and had no impact on design quality or character. Officers acknowledged the loss of the community hub but felt it was reasonable given the site's location and nearby existing community spaces. It was confirmed that the affordable housing contribution had been revised following a financial viability review, resulting in an off-site payment of £800,000, deemed the maximum reasonable offer. The</p>

	<p>application was recommended for approval subject to a deed of variation and review mechanisms.</p> <p>Councillors welcomed the £800,000 off-site affordable housing contribution and enquired whether the funds were earmarked specifically for genuinely affordable housing. It was confirmed that the cash-in-lieu would be used for developments offering London Affordable Rent (LAR) and could not be diverted elsewhere.</p> <p>A further question was raised about the construction management plan, specifically regarding wheel washing and operating hours, due to complaints about construction traffic on Tavistock Road. Officers confirmed that a construction management plan condition was already in place and committed to reviewing its details, including wheel washing, in coordination with the Highways team.</p> <p>Members raised no further concerns or queries but expressed a design to see progress on the development.</p> <p>The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the application be approved.</p>
96.	<p>ACORN YOUTH CLUB, COLOMBIA AVENUE, RUISLIP - 58215/APP/2025/1068 (<i>Agenda Item 10</i>)</p> <p>Erection of a single storey detached building for use by Acorn Youth Club</p> <p>Officers introduced the application for a single-storey building on the Acorn Youth Club site which had been referred to the Planning Committee because the London Borough of London owned the freehold. It was confirmed that the proposed building, intended for use by the Acorn Youth Club—a long-standing facility supporting disabled young people since 1993—was designed to sit on existing foundations from a previously approved but unbuilt structure. The building's height ranged from 2.95 to 3.45 metres, and officers confirmed that it complied with the local plan. With no significant site constraints and minimal impact, the application was recommended for approval.</p> <p>Members welcomed the application and raised no concerns or queries.</p> <p>The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the application be approved.</p>
97.	<p>ADDENDUM (<i>Agenda Item 11</i>)</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 Liz Penny on . Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.