

## Minutes

### HILLINGDON PLANNING COMMITTEE

11 February 2026

Meeting held at Committee Room 5 - Civic Centre



	<p><b>Committee Members Present:</b> Councillors Henry Higgins (Chair) Adam Bennett (Vice-Chair) Roy Chamdal Elizabeth Garelick Raju Sansarpuri Ekta Gohil Shehryar Ahmad-Wallana</p> <p><b>Ward Councillors Present:</b> Councillor Philip Corthorne Councillor Richard Mills Councillor Jan Sweeting</p> <p><b>LBH Officers Present:</b> Chris Brady, Planning Team Leader Eoin Concannon, Planning Team Leader Natalie Fairclough, Legal Advisor Roz Johnson, Head of Development Management &amp; Building Control Chris Lamb, Planning Officer Liz Penny, Democratic Services Officer Dr Alan Tilly, Transport Planning and Development Manager</p>
124.	<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies were received from Councillor Keith Burrows with Councillor Shehryar Ahmad-Wallana substituting.</p>
125.	<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>
126.	<p><b>TO RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING</b> (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b> That the minutes of the meeting dated 14 January 2026 be agreed as an accurate record.</p>
127.	<p><b>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
128.	<p><b>TO CONFIRM THAT THE ITEMS OF BUSINESS MARKED PART I WILL BE</b></p>

**CONSIDERED IN PUBLIC AND THE ITEMS MARKED PART II WILL BE CONSIDERED IN PRIVATE** (*Agenda Item 5*)

It was confirmed that all items of business were marked Part I and would be considered in public.

129. **1 HIGH ROAD, EASTCOTE - 20101/APP/2025/72** (*Agenda Item 6*)

**Erection of outbuilding to rear of office building.**

Officers introduced the application noting that the proposal complied with all the relevant planning policies and was therefore recommended for approval subject to the conditions specified within the report.

A petition in objection to the application had been received but the lead petitioner was not in attendance. The agent for the application chose not to address the Committee Members.

In response to Members' questions, officers confirmed that two conditions had been proposed to ensure that, should independent office use or residential use be proposed in the future, a new planning application would be required.

A question was raised by the Committee regarding parking, specifically whether the absence of additional employees - and therefore vehicle movements - could be enforced in perpetuity as part of the application.

It was explained that parking standards were determined by floor space, at a ratio of one parking space per 50–100 square metres of office space. It was noted that, even with the additional outbuilding, the overall floor area would not exceed approximately 150 square metres, hence no more than three parking spaces would be required. It was confirmed that the site already provided three off-street parking spaces and that even the addition of another employee would not alter the parking requirement under the Council's standards.

Members sought clarification as to why the increase in office space was not expected to generate additional parking demand.

It was reiterated that the assessment had been carried out strictly against the Council's parking policies, which were based on floor space. The increased floor area would still comply with policy, and the existing parking provision already met the required standard. It was also clarified that, although the applicant had stated that no additional staff were proposed, the assessment had been based on land use rather than any particular operator. Therefore, even a future operator with different staffing patterns would still be bound by the same parking standards, which had been satisfied.

Councillors asked whether granting approval could set a precedent for further commercial intensification in rear gardens within the locality.

Officers confirmed that each application would have to be assessed on its own merits and that the approval of this proposal would not set a precedent. It was noted that other outbuildings already existed in the surrounding area, and it was considered that the proposal would not be out of character. Nevertheless, it was emphasised that all future applications would be judged individually.

No further concerns were raised by the Committee. The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously agreed subject to the conditions set out in the report.

**RESOLVED: That the application be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report.**

130. **31 GREAT CENTRAL AVENUE, SOUTH RUISLIP - 43100/APP/2025/1424** (*Agenda Item 7*)

**Erection of a first-floor extension over existing building to create a two storey dwelling.**

Officers introduced the application, noting its relationship to neighbouring properties, compliance with design policies, and adherence to standards relating to character, amenity, daylight/sunlight, and parking. The application was recommended for approval.

A petition in objection to the application had been received. A petitioner was in attendance and addressed the Committee Members. Key points highlighted included:

- It was noted that the report had stated no significant harm would be caused to the character of the street, yet 130 neighbours - all from Great Central Avenue and adjoining roads - had signed a petition disagreeing with this, a figure higher than the incorrectly reported 101 signatures;
- The petitioner acknowledged variation in house types on Great Central Avenue but noted that the proposal would create a six-bedroom property with potential for seven, which was not reflective of the typical two- or three-bedroom pattern on the road;
- It was argued that comparisons to No. 18 were misleading because that property had only three bedrooms, unlike the scale of the proposal;
- Concerns were raised that increasing bedroom numbers would likely lead to more occupants and more cars, worsening existing parking pressures in a permit-restricted street;
- Although the report stated BRE standards would be met, the petitioner questioned whether "sufficient" daylight would be acceptable for gardens and homes, especially as daylight assessments had not been carried out on frequently used non-habitable areas such as hallways, staircases, and bathrooms;
- It was highlighted that some windows, including those providing the only natural light to key internal areas, appeared not to have been properly assessed, leading to concerns about reduced light and increased risks when using stairs.
- Existing drainage issues were referenced, including a recent blockage affecting multiple properties, suggesting that a six- or seven-bedroom dwelling could exacerbate the problem.
- It was pointed out that No. 31 already had lawful permission for a roof alteration that would provide additional space without harming neighbours, unlike the current proposal;
- It was argued that the report did not reflect the strength or scale of local concern, noting that 130 households had consistently sought updates for eight months;
- It was stated that the proposal benefited only one household while negatively impacting many others and therefore the Committee was urged to refuse the

application.

The applicant was also in attendance and addressed the Committee highlighting the following key points:

- The applicant clarified that the proposed extension was not intended for HMO use, resale, subdivision, or any commercial purpose;
- It was explained that the extension was required solely to meet the needs of the applicant's family, including two young children and a daughter with complex medical needs who was unable to climb stairs and required her own bedroom;
- It was noted that additional family support frequently came from relatives abroad, and the existing layout with one small office and a single bathroom was inadequate for their circumstances;
- It was stated that the applicant worked remotely as a senior software consultant and required a dedicated office space, which the current property could not provide;
- The applicant outlined that the six-bedroom layout would accommodate a bedroom for his daughter, a playroom for the twins, an office, a guest room, and a room for the applicant and his wife;
- In response to concerns about the character of the street, the applicant referenced multiple nearby properties with four to five bedrooms or more and noted that several neighbouring homes had already undergone extensions;
- The applicant referred to a professional daylight assessment which had concluded that BRE guidelines were met and that neighbouring properties had only non-habitable windows facing the site;
- It was stated that the dwelling would remain a single-family home, with no significant increase in household water usage or drainage impact, despite past drainage issues in the area;
- It was confirmed that the household owned only two cars and had no capacity or intention to add a third, so parking demand would not increase;
- Construction management would, according to the applicant, be handled carefully, with deliveries scheduled outside peak hours and works limited to 8:30am–5:00pm;
- It was noted that all relevant planning policies had been complied with and that the extension was necessary to support the applicant's daughter's medical needs, the twins' future need for separate rooms, and long-term family stability;
- The applicant concluded by requesting approval of the application, noting that they may not have the financial means to pursue such works later in life.

Councillors sought reassurance that the proposal was for a family home rather than an HMO and asked whether vehicle numbers would remain unchanged. The applicant confirmed that the property already had space for three cars but only two were owned, with no capacity or intention to add a third vehicle.

Members asked which application the applicant intended to pursue, noting that a certificate of lawful development for the roof space had already been granted the previous July. The applicant explained that the lawful development option had originally been explored, but the resulting rooms would have been too small, leading them to pursue a full planning application to provide adequate space for their family's needs.

Ward Councillor Richard Mills was in attendance and addressed the Committee in support of petitioners. Key points highlighted included:

- The Councillor confirmed that he was speaking in support of neighbouring residents who had opposed the application, referencing a petition with over 100 signatures, written objections, and his own Ward Members objections;
- It was emphasised that residents did not oppose change in principle but believed the proposal to be disproportionate, harmful to local character, and dismissive of cumulative impacts required by planning policy;
- Councillor Mills noted that although the report relied heavily on the street's variation, such variation did not justify overdevelopment;
- The proposal was described as turning a modest bungalow into a six- to seven-bedroom, two-storey dwelling, representing a major increase in scale, mass, and intensity on the plot;
- It was argued that nearby two-storey homes were not comparable, as some had been entirely rebuilt or approved under different policies;
- Councillor Mills highlighted that the increased ridge height—approximately eight metres—would sit directly beside neighbouring gardens and windows, causing an increased sense of enclosure and reduced outlook;
- It was stated that compliance with minimum technical standards did not automatically equate to planning acceptability and that planning decisions should consider what was reasonable and fair to neighbouring residents;
- Concerns were raised that the increase from two to six bedrooms provided no additional off-street parking in an area already affected by parking pressure and controls;
- It was noted that increased visits from extended family, deliveries, and day-to-day comings and goings were foreseeable with a dwelling of this scale, regardless of its formal use class;
- Reference to 18 Great Central Avenue as a comparable property was questioned because it was reportedly subject to ongoing planning enforcement;
- It was concluded that, although the application might meet certain technical thresholds, the judgement on scale, intensity, character, and neighbour impact indicated that the proposal went too far;
- The Committee was requested to refuse the application or, at minimum, defer it for meaningful reductions in scale to better reflect the character of Great Central Avenue and the expectations of neighbouring residents.

Members enquired whether planning approval would be required, should the applicant later sell the property or seek to change its use to an HMO. It was confirmed that this was correct; Article 4 was in place and any such change of use would need new planning permission.

Councillors sought clarity as to why the significant increase in size and bulk was considered appropriate and compatible with the established street scene. Officers noted that planning policy supported the creation of larger family homes and that, despite the scale of six bedrooms, the proposal remained a family dwelling. It was explained that the height and form would align with neighbouring two-storey properties, that the eaves height would be lower than that of No. 33, and that the ridgeline would reflect the character of the area. Officers found the proposal acceptable in design terms.

Members requested the percentage reduction in daylight and sunlight to neighbouring gardens and side windows. It was explained that BRE guidance required at least half of a garden to receive two hours of sunlight on 21 March, and that No. 29 currently

received 68% sunlight, which would fall only to 67%, representing a reduction of less than 1%. Regarding No. 33, officers confirmed that no reduction would occur, and therefore no basis for refusal existed on garden daylight grounds.

In response to further questions from the Committee, it was clarified that side-facing windows serving non-habitable rooms were not afforded protection under policy, and since BRE and local standards applied only to habitable rooms, those requirements had been met. Officers therefore concluded that there were no grounds for refusal relating to daylight impacts on non-habitable side windows.

Members noted that the proposed development fell within policy constraints and would be unlikely to be overturned at appeal. The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously agreed subject to the conditions set out in the report.

**RESOLVED: That the application be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report.**

131. **30-34 STATION ROAD, WEST DRAYTON - 31877/APP/2025/2771** (*Agenda Item 8*)

**Infilling of existing ATM aperture area, fenestration changes including the replacement of a bay window with an automatic sliding door and replacing existing single swing door with fixed shopfront glazing.**

It was explained that the two related applications (agenda items 8 and 9) would be introduced together for clarity. Officers also provided an update noting that additional petition signatures had been received after publication of the Committee report. It was outlined that the first application concerned alterations to the shopfront (agenda item 8), while the second related to the installation of plant equipment at the rear (agenda item 9), with both proposals assessed only within the limited scope of their described works since no change of use was involved. Officers advised that design impacts, noise assessments and planning history had been fully reviewed, confirmed that no increase in background noise or breach of policy would occur, and recommended approval of both applications.

A petition had been received in objection to the application, and a petitioner was in attendance to address the Committee. Key points highlighted included:

- The petitioner had lived directly behind 34 Station Road since 2006 and spoke on behalf of residents of West Drayton, particularly those on Ferrers Avenue adjoining the proposed site.
- It was expressed that although no change of use class was proposed, the opening of a Tesco store was considered likely to alter the established character of Station Road and intensify activity in a manner uncharacteristic of the neighbourhood.
- Concerns were raised that increased traffic, delivery vehicles, parking demand, noise, lighting, and extended operational hours would be experienced along Ferrers Avenue and would directly affect the daily access routes and living conditions.
- It was highlighted that parking shortages and congestion were already experienced by residents, and fines had previously been issued due to the lack of available spaces.

- It was argued that planning decisions should have considered not only economic factors but also the lived experience of long-standing residents, whose quality of life could be adversely affected.
- The Committee was asked to consider whether the proposed development would genuinely enhance the area or instead undermine both the character of Station Road and the amenity of those who lived there.

Councillors asked whether the resident had experienced any issues when the bank previously occupied the site that would not be experienced now. The resident confirmed that no such issues had occurred with the bank and noted that any problems would arise from increased Tesco-related traffic rather than from the former use.

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

- It was emphasised that the applications sought only fenestration changes and the installation of new plant equipment, and that they did not involve a change of use.
- The agent clarified that a Tesco store could have opened on the site without planning permission, as the lawful use already fell within Class E, the same use class as the former bank.
- It was stated that many objections related to concerns about use rather than to the physical works, and such matters were not material considerations in this case.
- It was noted that, even if use were relevant, the site lay within a primary shopping area in a designated district centre, where retail activity was supported by local and national planning policy.
- It was highlighted that officers had concluded the proposals were acceptable, would not harm local character or amenity, and would support the viability of the centre by preventing a sizeable unit from remaining vacant.
- The agent added that, although the use was not in question, the development would also create employment opportunities.
- It was explained that planning conditions could not lawfully be imposed on matters outside the scope of the applications, as such conditions would fail the required national policy tests.
- The agent requested that both applications be approved in accordance with the officer recommendations.

Members enquired whether the applicant had a plan for deliveries and whether any such information might reassure petitioners. The agent replied that he could not confirm specific delivery arrangements but stated that Tesco operated rigorous delivery plans, all of which would comply with existing highway restrictions; he added that the store would also require separate licensing and that statutory nuisance procedures would remain available to residents.

Councillors raised questions about the size of delivery lorries and expressed concern about potential noise generated by the proposed AC units, particularly at midnight. It was explained that the noise impact assessment had been based on background measurement surveys, with plant noise tested against those levels, and that the submitted assessment demonstrated no harmful noise impact. When asked which hours the assessment had covered, the agent was unable to confirm, and officers clarified that the assessment measured background noise associated solely with the plant equipment, not with vehicle or pedestrian movements. Officers further explained

that similar plant equipment already operated in the area, sometimes closer to residential properties, and that the submitted report had been reviewed by the Council's noise specialist. It was confirmed that conditions had been imposed to ensure noise levels remained below background levels; any attempt to impose stricter conditions would likely be considered unreasonable and vulnerable to appeal.

Members were reminded that delivery management fell outside the scope of planning control. Councillors asked what engagement had been undertaken with local residents, including those living above the premises. The agent responded that no engagement had been undertaken by the planning consultant but explained that Tesco ordinarily conducted community engagement once it began fitting out a store, using designated engagement managers.

The Committee queried whether a noise assessment had been undertaken for flats located to the side of the building rather than only those at the front. In response, the agent confirmed that the assessment had been carried out against the nearest residential receptor but could not confirm the precise distance without the report. Officers cautioned against speculating on figures and reiterated that the technical report had been assessed in line with standard procedures, with no sound evidence available to contradict its conclusions.

Ward Councillor Jan Sweeting was also in attendance and addressed the Committee highlighting the following points:

- Councillor Sweeting supported the petitioners and many local residents who had submitted numerous objections to Members of the Planning Committee, Licensing Sub-Committee, Members of Parliament, and local councillors regarding the applications affecting the building.
- It was noted that although the application appeared to concern only minor alterations to the former Lloyds Bank building, the resulting occupation by a Tesco Express would, in residents' view, produce a major impact on the local area, adjacent businesses, nearby flats on Ferrers Avenue and Station Road, and the wider highways network.
- The Councillor refuted the officers' assertion that the development would not have a significant impact, arguing that supermarket traffic would inevitably exceed that associated with a bank.
- Concerns were presented about crime and antisocial behaviour, supported by information from the local police sergeant, who stated that Boots—located nearby—was already one of the highest-crime venues in the area, second only to the existing Tesco Metro on Station Road.
- It was argued that approving the application would effectively position the store with the highest crime rate next to the store with the second-highest in West Drayton, adjacent to a location where a murder had occurred in January 2022.
- The Councillor concluded that, although the planning application appeared minor, its approval would have major long-term implications by altering the character of Station Road and negatively affecting local residents and businesses.

The Chair asked Councillor Sweeting whether she had any concerns about the specific works proposed, namely the infilling of the ATM and the fenestration changes. The Councillor confirmed that these alterations were minor and did not raise concern but that she wished to highlight wider issues that had not been presented to the Licensing Sub-Committee. The Chair advised caution, noting that crime-related matters were

outside the remit of the Planning Committee and emphasised the need to focus discussion strictly on the planning application.

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

**RESOLVED: That the application be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report.**

132. **30-34 STATION ROAD, WEST DRAYTON - 31877/APP/2025/2768** (*Agenda Item 9*)

**Installation of new plant solution and boundary treatment to rear of store.**

This application was considered in tandem with the previous application.

A petition had been received in objection to the application, and a representative of the petitioners was in attendance to address the Committee. The Chair reminded the petitioner that discussion must remain limited to the plant equipment and associated noise, as the broader concerns relating to Tesco's operations had already been addressed under the previous application. Key points highlighted included:

- The petitioner acknowledged that the application related only to plant installation but argued that the officer report had taken an excessively narrow approach, stating that wider impacts such as highway safety, congestion and servicing - referenced in Local Plan policies DMT 1, DMT 2 and London Plan policy T4 - should have been considered because the plant facilitated the store's operation.
- The Chair intervened, stating that references to deliveries and operational matters were not relevant to this application and instructing the petitioner to confine comments to issues associated with the plant equipment.
- The petitioner then raised concerns about potential air-quality impacts arising indirectly from the development, arguing that the plant installation was intrinsically linked to the operation of the retail business. The Chair again clarified that such matters related to the previous item and were not material to the application under consideration.
- The petitioner proceeded to address noise impacts, asserting that the submitted noise impact assessment did not accurately represent the likely disturbance from continuously operating plant equipment, particularly during night-time hours when background noise would be lower.
- The petitioner questioned how continuous night-time noise would be mitigated and requested clarification on where comparable units existed locally and what noise assessments had accompanied those installations.
- Officers reiterated that the noise report had been prepared by an appropriately qualified professional, assessed by the Council's own noise consultant, and conditioned to ensure plant noise remained below background levels.
- The Chair again reminded the petitioner that only matters directly related to the plant equipment were relevant and emphasised that broader concerns about Tesco's operations could not form part of the Committee's determination.
- The petitioner concluded by stating that although some matters fell outside the strict scope of the application, the plant installation would have a "vicarious effect" enabling the store to operate, which was why residents had raised such concerns and signed the petition.

The agent for the application addressed the Committee Members highlighting the following points:

- It was clarified that the proposal related to a Tesco Express, identified as a small-scale retail convenience store.
- The shop floor area was confirmed as below 280 square metres to ensure compliance with Sunday Trading Act requirements.
- The noise assessment had been reviewed during the meeting, and it was noted that the first-floor flatted property, located approximately 7–9 metres away, had been used as the reference point.
- Appendix A (page 19) of the noise report indicated that the air-conditioning units would operate only during opening hours, anticipated to be between 7:00 a.m. and 11:00 p.m., in line with typical Express-store operating times.
- It was stated that the refrigeration plant equipment would run continuously, as expected for such systems.
- Reference was made to previous site visits involving unauthorised plant installations that resulted in noise issues; however, it was emphasised that the proposed equipment comprised highly efficient and quiet models.
- It was asserted that sufficient evidence had been submitted and that no adverse noise impact was anticipated.

Members asked whether the proposed units were going to be connected to the building at ground level, explaining that the schematics were unclear. The agent replied that three units were connected at the boundary of the infill section and that one was positioned approximately one metre from the side elevation. He clarified that the units were located at the rear of the shops rather than at the front and referred to photographs that showed their position.

Councillors asked about the proposed opening time of the premises, which was 6:00 a.m., and questioned whether the heat pumps would be switched on earlier so that they would be fully operational by opening time. The agent stated that he did not know the exact answer but understood that the units generally operated during store opening hours.

Officers explained that a noise condition was being proposed. They stated that the condition restricted the maximum noise level regardless of opening hours or operational requirements. They added that different daytime and evening limits applied and that the evening limits were more restrictive.

Members enquired whether operational time limits would be monitored and whether noise monitoring would take place periodically. It was confirmed that the condition was prescriptive but would not be actively monitored due to limited resources. It was explained that this approach was standard and that enforcement would rely on residents reporting noise concerns to planning enforcement or to the noise team through other legislation.

The Committee then asked whether the condition was considered strong or whether it would be issued as an informative. Officers confirmed that a formal condition—Condition 4—had been drafted and would be enforceable, whereas an informative would not.

Ward Councillor Jan Sweeting was also in attendance and spoke in support of petitioners asking the Committee to consider the planning reasons for refusing the

application.

Councillor Sweeting referred to Article 1.6 and disputed the assertion that the proposal would have no harmful impact on the highways network, stating that the existing network was already operating at capacity, with issues such as long queues and double parking.

It was stated that the AC units and gas cooler system, although producing low-level noise, would emit continuous sound, including a noticeable hum at night. Councillor Sweeting noted that similar facilities had previously caused disturbance to neighbours, leading to enforcement action by the Council.

It was further argued that the installation of the plant was essential for the supermarket's operation, thereby establishing a direct link between the proposal and the impact on residential amenity and community well-being. Councillor Sweeting asserted that approving the application would prioritise developer rights over community rights.

Members observed that the proposed noise condition appeared stringent, particularly the requirement for noise levels not to exceed 40 decibels between 11pm and 7am. It was noted that this level was comparable to a quiet library or a refrigerator hum. It was further noted that, as the proposal did not constitute a change of use, matters such as deliveries and parking could not be considered. Councillors observed that re-occupation of the vacant High Street unit would be beneficial in preventing decline, crime, and antisocial behaviour.

Councillors considered the proposed conditions to be robust and noted that the Committee would require exceptionally strong grounds to overturn the officer recommendation. It was also recognised that any refusal might be overturned on appeal.

Members enquired whether the new fencing and plant enclosure would reduce rear access or increase pressure on on-street parking. Officers responded that the location in question was not an area used for parking by the unit. It was explained that a sufficient amount of pay-and-display parking was located directly outside the premises. It was confirmed that parking was not a material planning consideration for this application, as the unit could be occupied by Tesco or another operator at any time. It was reiterated that the only matters under consideration were shopfront alterations and plant equipment, and no parking spaces were proposed for removal.

Councillors questioned whether the shift from a financial services function to retail constituted a different use and whether the installation of refrigeration plant, which generated noise, might amount to a material change. They also asked whether the local authority had discretion to determine whether the change was permitted development or required planning permission.

In response officers confirmed that the Council did not have discretion to determine whether development constituted permitted development. Reference was made to the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order, which set out what did and did not constitute development. It was explained that the former bank operated under Use Class E(c), and movement to retail within Use Class E(a) remained within the same overarching use class. As such, no change of use had occurred, and the proposal constituted permitted development. Officers stated that this

legislative framework had been introduced to reduce vacancy in primary shopping areas. Consequently, the Council could not require planning permission for the change of occupier or use when both fell within Class E.

Members sought further clarification as to whether the intensification associated with the new use constituted a material change. The Legal Advisor reiterated that movement within the same use class did not amount to a material change of use and therefore did not require planning permission. It was emphasised that this position was set out in law and not subject to local discretion. Members heard that legislative changes had been introduced to support declining High Streets and encourage commercial occupation to deter antisocial behaviour.

No further concerns were raised. The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, agreed with six Members voting in favour and one abstention.

**RESOLVED: That the application be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report.**

133. **11 ELLESMERE CLOSE, RUISLIP - 79635/APP/2025/2209** (*Agenda Item 10*)

**Erection of a single storey side and rear extension, following demolition of existing garage (AMENDED PLANS).**

Officers introduced the application highlighting the site context, existing and proposed plans and flood-risk mitigation. It was confirmed that the scale, design, neighbour impacts, and landscaping restoration were all policy-compliant. As the proposal met local planning guidance and included appropriate mitigation measures, officers recommended approval.

Ward Councillor Philip Corthorne was in attendance to address the Committee Members. Key points highlighted included:

- Councillor Corthorne emphasised that he was speaking solely in his capacity as a ward councillor and thanked the Planning Committee for considering the application following his request for a call-in.
- It was noted that long-standing concerns existed regarding the planning policy framework, which was viewed as failing to give adequate weight to increasing flood risk as a material planning consideration.
- Councillor Corthorne highlighted that flooding in the cul-de-sac was not theoretical, noting that residents had experienced repeated incidents over several decades, with one property affected on four occasions, largely due to the local topography causing water to accumulate around numbers 10 and 11.
- Reference was made to paragraph 7.43 of the report, where it had been stated that the proposed extension would not significantly increase flood risk, a conclusion the Councillor considered overly optimistic given the known flooding history.
- Even accepting officers' assessment at face value, it was noted that the report still acknowledged an element of increased flood risk, which was considered particularly concerning in this location.
- Councillor Corthorne urged Committee Members to rigorously question officers about the reliability and substance of the flood risk assessment, the meaning of sustainable drainage in this context, and the real-world effectiveness of proposed mitigation measures.

- It was stated that residents should be given clear justification as to how approval would offer them reassurance, given their previous traumatic flooding experiences.
- It was argued that a cited precedent (No. 12) was not directly comparable due to being located on higher ground and therefore should not be relied upon.
- The Committee was requested to give serious consideration to the concerns raised and, if refusal was not deemed possible, to apply robust scrutiny to officers' claims regarding flood risk and its management.

Members asked whether the proposed flood-mitigation measures would ensure that the extension did not increase flood risk for neighbouring properties, given the site's location within Flood Zone 3. In reply, officers stated that, although the footprint would extend slightly into the green area, the River Pinn was located over 20 metres away, and it was confirmed that the flood risk assessment had considered the adequacy of the proposed mitigation measures. It was explained that mitigation had been incorporated through reduced extension size, the demolition of the garage, and the installation of soft landscaping during the first planting season, thereby increasing flood-storage capacity and aligning with Environment Agency guidance.

Councillors queried the relevance of a planning inspector's decision referenced in the report. In reply, it was clarified that previous appeal decisions, even those concerning other locations, were material considerations when considering a planning application.

At the request of the Committee, it was agreed that, to manage the risk of flooding from surface water, additional surface-water details could be required by condition.

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

**RESOLVED:**

- 1. That the application be approved subject to the conditions in the report; and**
- 2. That the drafting of an additional condition in relation to managing the risk of flooding from surface water be delegated to the Planning Team Leader.**

The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 9.07 pm.

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