

## Minutes

### HILLINGDON PLANNING COMMITTEE

5 November 2025



Meeting held at Committee Room 5 - Civic Centre

	<p><b>Committee Members Present:</b> Councillors Henry Higgins (Chair), Adam Bennett (Vice-Chair), Keith Burrows, Roy Chamdal, Elizabeth Garelick, Jagjit Singh and Raju Sansarpuri</p> <p><b>LBH Officers Present:</b> Roz Johnson – Planning Services Manager Eoin Concannon – Planning Team Leader Ed Laughton – Area Planning Service Manager (C&amp;S) Haydon Richardson – Deputy Team Leader Dr Alan Tilly – Transport &amp; Aviation Team Manager Natalie Fairclough – Legal Advisor Anisha Teji – Democratic Services</p>
98.	<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>There were no apologies for absence.</p>
99.	<p><b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING</b> (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>Councillor Henry Higgins declared a non-pecuniary interest in agenda item 6 as he had met the applicant during a local Ward Surgery. He left the room during discussion of agenda item 6.</p>
100.	<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 2 October 2025 be approved.</p>
101.	<p><b>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
102.	<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. that all items would be heard in Part I.</p>
103.	<p><b>LAND TO THE REAR OF 18 MOOR PARK ROAD, NORTHWOOD - 74971/APP/2025/780</b> (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p>Erection of 1no. detached bungalow, with associated parking (including installation of new vehicular crossover), landscaping, cycle parking and refuse storage.</p>

Officers introduced the application, took Members through the plans and outlined the application history. A recommendation for approval was made.

A petitioner in objection to the application addressed the Committee, noting that the proposal would harm the street pattern by introducing a lone dwelling that conflicted with the existing layout. The petitioner stated that previous applications for similar development had been refused and argued that comparisons with 1a Grove Road were unjustified, as that case involved replacing a bungalow with a detached property in keeping with surrounding housing. The petitioner highlighted that the Planning Inspector had previously ruled the site unsuitable, stating that such development would cause unacceptable harm to the street scene. Further objections included loss of garden land contrary to Policy DMH6, overlooking and loss of privacy for neighbouring properties, and a negative impact on the area's spacious and open character. The petitioner highlighted that approval would set a harmful precedent and urged the Committee to refuse the application.

The agent addressed the Committee and commended officers for the well-written report. It was noted that the applicant had worked closely with officers to resolve issues raised in previous applications. It was explained that the revised scheme differed significantly in scale, design, and layout, and its impact on the character of the area had been carefully considered. Responding to concerns raised by the Planning Inspector, the agent highlighted that the proposal included a substantial reduction in size, enhanced landscaping, and a setback from the road, which together ensured minimal impact on the street scene. It was noted that the character of the road had evolved since the earlier scheme was assessed. The design was said to have been prepared to avoid harm to visual amenity and highway safety. The agent emphasised that the proposed bungalow was located within a residential area, complied with officers' requirements, and made efficient use of the site. It was clarified that planning policy did not prohibit development on garden land, provided it was carried out sensitively. The agent stated that objectors' concerns had been fully addressed and reminded Members that planning decisions required a balance of competing considerations. The Committee was urged to approve the application, with the agent stressing that refusal should only occur where demonstrable and significant harm could be shown.

In response to Members' questions, the agent explained that after the appeal decision, a revised scheme was developed in consultation with officers. The new application addressed the Planning Inspector's comments and was designed to avoid any harmful impact on the area's character.

During Committee discussions, officers explained that a larger two-storey dwelling would not have fitted appropriately within a rear garden. Under garden development policies, a single-storey dwelling was considered more proportionate and the reduction in size allowed for additional landscaping and biodiversity improvements. Officers noted that this scheme differed from previous proposals and that the bungalow design was suitable for the plot.

Members acknowledged that this was back garden development and sought clarity on the Planning Inspector's previous comments that any development would harm the street scene. They also queried whether conditions could prevent further development. Officers confirmed that the appeal decision had been considered however the revised scheme complied with policy DMH6. The reduced scale maintained local character and

	<p>biodiversity. Each property was over 21 metres apart, protecting privacy and preventing overlooking and the single-storey design ensured no impact on lighting. Biodiversity net gain had increased on the site, making this proposal materially different from the appeal decision. Officers added that a condition removing permitted development rights was included and any future applications would be assessed at the time.</p> <p>The scheme contributed to housing needs, complied with planning policies and its scale had been significantly reduced. Officers advised that in their opinion refusal would likely be unsuccessfully defended at appeal. The Committee was assured that the inspector's comments had been taken into account.</p> <p>Although Members empathised with the petitioner's concerns, it was noted that the new application met policy requirements and that overturning the officer recommendation would be difficult. The recommendation was therefore moved, seconded, and, when put to a vote, five Members voted in favour and one abstained.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED: That the application be approved as per officer recommendation.</b></p>
104.	<p><b>CLUB HOUSE, MIDDLESEX STADIUM, BREAKSPEAR ROAD, RUISLIP - 17942/APP/2024/2874</b> (<i>Agenda Item 7</i>)</p> <p><b>Construction of natural grass football pitches using imported soils approved for use by the Environment Agency. Proposals include rainwater harvesting scheme, extensive planting</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the application and took Members through the plans. It was noted that a typographical amendment would need to be made to condition 4 to read 'Prior to commencement of development and scheme for the provision of sustainable water management shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.' A recommendation for approval was made.</p> <p>With the prior permission of the Chair, Councillor Peter Smallwood addressed the Committee highlighting his strong support for the application. The applicant's collaboration with Councillors, the Council and the Environment Agency was praised. The proposal was seen as vital for grassroots football, supporting community life, providing opportunities for all ages and preserving the legacy of Hillingdon Borough Football Club. It was noted that the scheme enhanced sports provision, improved drainage and biodiversity and maintained Green Belt openness.</p> <p>The Committee welcomed the proposal as a positive community benefit. Questions were asked about construction timing and traffic impact. Officers confirmed completion within three planting seasons and explained that traffic increases during soil importation would be temporary and managed through a Construction Management Plan. Lighting was addressed, with a condition requiring further approval for floodlighting.</p> <p>The application was proposed, seconded, and unanimously approved.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED: That the application be approved as per officer recommendation subject to the minor typographical amendment to condition 4.</b></p>

105.	<p><b>UNIT 2 RUISLIP RETAIL PARK, VICTORIA ROAD - 43510/APP/2024/3336</b> (<i>Agenda Item 8</i>)</p> <p>Officers introduced the application and took Members through the plans. A recommendation for approval and s106 legal agreement was made.</p> <p>The Committee welcomed the proposal, noting that the new unit would benefit the local area by creating business opportunities and jobs. In response to a question on the reduced contribution and sustainable measures, it was explained that the amount had been calculated using a detailed methodology considering benchmarks and site-specific constraints. Factors such as limited space, lack of tree planting, a secured travel plan, and no additional parking were taken into account. The contribution was confirmed as appropriate and reasonable, although a specific figure could not be provided as the proposal did not fit standard benchmarks.</p> <p>The officers' recommendation, was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, was unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED: That the s106 legal agreement and application be approved as per officer recommendation.</b></p>
	<p>The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 8.10 pm.</p>

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Anisha Teji on 01895277655 or [ateji@hillingdon.gov.uk](mailto:ateji@hillingdon.gov.uk). Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.