

Minutes

HILLINGDON PLANNING COMMITTEE

21 April 2026



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

	<p>Committee Members Present: Councillors Adam Bennett (Vice-Chair), Roy Chamdal, Elizabeth Garelick, Raju Sansarpuri, Ekta Gohil, Jas Dhot and Shehryar Ahmad-Wallana</p> <p>Also Present: Councillor Eddie Lavery (Ward Councillor for Ickenham and South Harefield) Councillor Jan Sweeting (Ward Councillor for West Drayton)</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: Roz Johnson - Head of Development Management & Building Control Ed Lauhgton - Area Planning Service Manager Grace Liu - Area Planning Service Manager Chris Brady – Planning Team Leader Eoin Concannon – Planning Team Leader Michael Briginshaw – Deputy Team Leader Mike Kemp – Deputy Team Leader Sally Robbins – Senior Planning Officer Dr Alan Tilly – Transport Planning and Development Team Manager Natalie Fairclough – Legal Advisor Anisha Teji – Democratic Services</p>
144.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Henry Higgins with Councillor Shehryar Ahmad – Wallana substituting.</p>
145.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
146.	<p>TO RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting dated 11 March 2026 be agreed as an accurate record.</p>
147.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
148.	<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

149. **BROADWATER LAKE 2382/APP/2023/2906** (*Agenda Item 6*)

Redevelopment of the site to create the Hillingdon Watersports Facility and Activity Centre including demolition of existing Broadwater Lake Sailing Club (BSC) clubhouse at the north of the lake and erection of a building including changing facilities, meeting rooms, storage, Workshop and seasonal worker accommodation (sui generis), activity shelters; installation of pontoons and slipways; boat shed; equipment storage huts; boat parking and racking areas; camping area; outdoor activity areas; ecological enhancement throughout the site; new pedestrian routes through the peninsula; landscaping including new woodland, dense vegetation screens and boundary treatment; access road; localised dredging and land reclamation; relocation of existing sailing area and creation of floating reedbeds within the lake; coach drop off and turning area; vehicle parking; cycle parking; and associated works.

[EIA Regulation 25 Re-Consultation: Further information is available in relation to the Environmental Statement which has already been provided. Please refer to document reference "ES Volume II Appendix 7.6 - Freshwater Ecology Surveys_Part 5 (Dated November 2025)", uploaded on 27-02-26. Representations should be made by 4th April 2026.]

Officers introduced the application, took Members through the plans and addendum. A recommendation for approval and sec 106 was made.

A petitioner addressed the Committee and confirmed there was no objection to the application, supporting the principle of the proposal and the relocation of HOAC to Broadwater Lake, which was described as a significant loss for young people during its absence. The long-standing relationship between HOAC and Broadwater Sailing Club (BSC) was outlined, along with BSC's role in providing affordable sailing for over 50 years. Concerns were raised that relocating BSC would create operational and safety issues due to limited space, tree cover impacting wind conditions, reduced sailing areas, poor visibility and insufficient parking and facilities. It was also noted that the relocation could increase disturbance to the nearby nature conservation area and incur unnecessary costs. It was submitted that the response to the petition had not addressed the primary issue of why BSC could not remain at its current location. Clarification was requested regarding the objection from Natural England, as no evidence had been provided to the club. A site visit was requested and assurance was sought that BSC's existing hours of operation would remain unchanged should planning permission be granted.

The agent addressed the Committee and referred to presentation slides circulated before the meeting. It was explained that an assessment of 71 alternative sites, carried out in line with national planning policy and accepted by Council officers and Natural England, had identified Broadwater Lake as the only suitable and deliverable location for the replacement HOAC facility. The site's former use for gravel extraction and its current industrial and unmanaged condition were outlined, with the SSSI noted to be in an unfavourable state due to lack of management and antisocial behaviour. It was explained that the development would be limited to existing hard-standing and had been shaped by ecological advice and specialist input. Other options, including sharing

a site with Broadwater Sailing Club at the northern end of the lake, were considered but ruled out due to underground gas infrastructure and ecological constraints, following advice from Natural England. Support for the scheme was confirmed by the trustees of HOAC and the main committee of BSC. It was acknowledged that the site is in the Green Belt but it was stated that very special circumstances had been demonstrated through strong social, community and environmental benefits. The proposal was described as delivering a fully accessible facility for vulnerable children and adults, bringing a derelict former industrial site back into use, improving site management and the condition of the SSSI. Members were urged to support the officer recommendation and grant planning permission.

In response to Members' questions, it was confirmed that alternative locations had been considered. While the northern end of the lake was acknowledged as more suitable for sailing, the southern location was considered acceptable given the wider site constraints. It was explained that environmental impacts had been carefully balanced against community need and that the scheme had been revised in 2023 to avoid sensitive areas. It was also stated that the proposal represented a clear improvement on previous facilities, with the sailing area remaining unchanged and the launch arrangements considered acceptable.

Councillor Eddie Lavery, Ward Councillor for Ickenham & South Harefield, addressed the Committee and said the proposal would replace a valued community facility lost due to HS2, benefiting local residents, the wider borough and community groups. It was noted that significant work had been carried out to balance environmental concerns with delivering a modern facility. The site was described as a former quarry with extensive hard-standing and an SSSI in an unfavourable condition, as confirmed by Natural England. It was stated that the scheme would improve site management and ecology, that objections from Natural England and the Environment Agency had been resolved, and Members were urged to support the officer recommendation.

Members discussed how the BSC's existing hours of operation could be safeguarded. They were advised that this would be managed through an Operational Management and Activities Plan. Hours would be agreed with stakeholders, taking account of ecological considerations and advice from Natural England. Officers explained that setting specific hours through planning conditions would not be appropriate. However, it was confirmed that flexibility for the sailing club would be sought when the condition was discharged. Members were advised of the proposed staff and activity hours and noted that ecological assessments had been carried out on the basis that the sailing club would continue operating as it does currently.

Members raised questions about external lighting, and officers confirmed that several planning conditions would be used to protect sensitive habitats. The site selection process was outlined, with Broadwater Lake identified as the preferred option following an assessment of 71 sites. Funding and viability were discussed and it was confirmed that sufficient contingency was in place and that funding was not a material planning consideration.

On balance, Members agreed that the proposal was an improvement on earlier schemes and delivered clear community and environmental benefits. The officer recommendation was moved, seconded and agreed unanimously.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved as per officer recommendation.

150.	<p>29 CLAMMAS WAY 77795/APP/2025/2979 (<i>Agenda Item 7</i>)</p> <p>Erection of 2x two storey, 3 bed dwelling with associated parking, amenity space, cycle and refuse stores, following the demolition of existing bungalow</p> <p>Officers introduced the application, took Members through the plans and made a recommendation for approval.</p> <p>A written submission from a local resident living opposite the site was read to the Committee, objecting to the proposal. It was stated that the development would overdevelop a constrained plot, replacing a single bungalow with two dwellings that were considered out of keeping with the character and open appearance of the area. Concerns were raised that, although space standards were met, the homes would be cramped and poorly suited to family living. It was also submitted that the proposal would create a more urban street scene, raise doubts about deliverability due to viability concerns, and that the objection was supported by around 50 local residents. The Committee was asked to refuse the planning application.</p> <p>The agent was not in attendance.</p> <p>A written submission was also received from Councillor Tony Burles, Ward Councillor for Uxbridge, objecting to the application. It was stated that the proposal constituted significant overdevelopment and would appear incongruous on a quiet residential road characterised by houses and bungalows. It was considered that local residents' objections were reasonable and had not been fully addressed. A site visit was requested prior to a final decision and refusal or deferral of the application was sought.</p> <p>The Committee noted that the officer report concluded the proposal complied with relevant policy. Members sought clarification on public transport accessibility and parking and it was confirmed that the site had a PTAL rating of 1b but benefited from nearby bus routes between Uxbridge High Street and Cowley. It was also confirmed that one parking space per dwelling was policy compliant, parking restrictions applied and future residents would be eligible for parking permits.</p> <p>Clarification was also sought on bedroom sizes and it was confirmed that all units met the minimum internal space standards set out in the London Plan.</p> <p>The officers' recommendation was moved, seconded and, when put to the vote, was unanimously agreed.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the application be approved as per officer recommendation.</p>
151.	<p>38 FRAYS AVENUE 58891/APP/2026/107 (<i>Agenda Item 8</i>)</p> <p>Conversion of loft space to habitable use to include raising ridge height, roof lights to front, rear and side, rear half-hipped loft window, and amendments to fenestration.</p> <p>Officers introduced the application, took Members through the plans and addendum. A recommendation for approval and sec 106 was made.</p> <p>The Legal Advisor advised that the petitioner's additional documents had been submitted late and had not been considered by Members. It was agreed that the</p>

representation would proceed without referring to them, with the relevant extract read aloud within the allocated speaking time.

The petitioner addressed the Committee in objection to the proposal, stating that No. 38 Frays Avenue was located within a valued area of special local character, originally developed predominantly with bungalows, where three-storey properties were not characteristic. Concern was raised that raising the roof and adding dormer windows would result in an unattractive crown roof that conflicted with local design guidance and harmed the character of the area. It was argued that a neighbouring property should not be treated as a precedent and that approval could lead to further similar developments, fundamentally altering the character of the Garden City area. Reference was made to the loss of character in another conservation area due to cumulative permitted development. The Committee was asked to refuse the application in order to protect the area's special character.

The agent was not in attendance.

Members acknowledged concerns about changes to the area's character but noted that existing nearby three-storey development made resistance difficult. The petitioner maintained that such development remained out of keeping with the predominantly bungalow-led area and highlighted that earlier approvals risked eroding its special character.

Councillor Jan Sweeting, Ward Councillor for West Drayton, addressed the Committee in support of the petitioners and stated that the proposal would harm the character of the Garden City area of special local character. Reference was made to a residents' report submitted in 2021, which set out principles to prevent overdevelopment, including limiting extensions to two storeys and opposing crown roofs. It was submitted that the proposal conflicted with these principles, would set an undesirable precedent and further erode the area's distinctive character. Members were urged to refuse the application and work with residents to protect the area.

Members sought clarification on whether neighbouring properties amounted to three storey development and how those permissions had been granted. Officers clarified that surrounding properties were two storey dwellings with accommodation in the roof space and that a modest increase in ridge height did not constitute an additional storey. It was explained that nearby permissions had been granted through delegated decisions and appeal, establishing a relevant precedent. Officers advised that the proposed roof increase was limited, the crown roof was modest and not visible from the street and that refusal would be unlikely to withstand appeal. Members acknowledged that while the area's character had evolved over time, a precedent had been established.

The application was proposed and seconded for approval in accordance with the officer recommendation.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved as per officer recommendation.

152. **RAINBOW AND KIRBY 38058/APP/2025/2613** (*Agenda Item 9*)

Demolition of existing structures and phased re-development of the site to provide nine plots ranging between three and 11 storeys in height (including ground level) to include residential uses (Use Class C3), flexible retail/cafe/restaurant floorspace (Class E (a,b,c)), light industrial floorspace

	<p>(Class E (g)(iii)), associated hard and soft landscaping, car parking, cycling parking, servicing, refuse and plant areas, public realm improvements, highways works and other works associated with the development.</p> <p>Officers introduced the application, highlighted report corrections, and recommended approval. It was noted that the Heads of Terms should include the public open space and carbon offset contributions, and that references to “reserved matters” were not applicable as the proposal was a full planning application.</p> <p>Members considered this to be a significant scheme which had been properly assessed.</p> <p>The officers’ recommendation, was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, was unanimously agreed.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the application and s106 be approved as per officer recommendation.</p>
153.	<p>AVONDALE DRIVE 76551/APP/2025/3242 (<i>Agenda Item 10</i>)</p> <p>Reserved Matters Application (Access, Appearance, Landscaping, Layout and Scale) pursuant to Condition 1 of Application ref: 76551/APP/2025/2861 (Application submitted under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to vary Conditions 3 (Approved Plans); 4 (Approved Supporting Plans/Documents); 5 (Development Scope); 6 (Mix of Units); 7 (Phasing); 9 (Residential Density); 10 (Development Height); and 15 (Landscaping) of planning permission ref. 76551/APP/2021/4502 dated 28-09-2022. (Hybrid planning application seeking OUTLINE permission (with all matters reserved) for residential floorspace (Class C3) including demolition of all existing buildings and structures; erection of new buildings; new pedestrian and vehicular accesses; associated amenity space, open space, landscaping; car and cycle parking spaces; plant, refuse storage, servicing area and other works incidental to the proposed development; and FULL planning permission for Block A comprising 30 residential units (Class C3); new pedestrian access; associated amenity space and landscaping; cycle parking, refuse storage, and other associated infrastructure) to increase the number of homes, remove the existing parking court and increase podium size, revise the height strategy, removal of vehicle access and increase separation distances to create a new public square).</p> <p>Officers introduced the application, took Members through the plans and made a recommendation for approval.</p> <p>The officers’ recommendation, was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, was unanimously agreed.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the application be approved as per officer recommendation.</p>
154.	<p>1 & 1A BATH ROAD 35805/APP/2756 (<i>Agenda Item 11</i>)</p> <p>Reserved Matters relating to Landscaping of outline planning permission ref: 35805/APP/2020/3289 dated 01-11-2022 for (Outline planning application for the demolition of existing buildings and erection of a six storey 237-bedroom hotel (Use Class C1) (landscaping reserved for subsequent approval).</p>

	<p>Officers introduced the application, took Members through the plans and made a recommendation for approval.</p> <p>The officers' recommendation, was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, was unanimously agreed.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the application be approved as per officer recommendation.</p>
155.	<p>HIGHVIEW FARM 12579/APP/2025/615 (<i>Agenda Item 12</i>)</p> <p>Construction of a replacement Waste Transfer Station Building (Amended Red Outline on Location and Site Plan)</p> <p>Officers introduced the application, took Members through the plans and made a recommendation for approval.</p> <p>Members sought clarification on impacts to the Green Belt and proposed operating hours. It was confirmed that hours of operation were previously 07:30-18:00 Monday-Friday and at no time on Sundays or Public Holidays. Current proposal is to extend to 07:00-18:00 every day (including Sundays and Public Holidays) following stakeholder consultation to allow occasional weekend and bank holiday waste collections, helping to spread vehicle movements and reduce impacts on residents.</p> <p>The officers' recommendation, was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, was unanimously agreed.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the application be approved as per officer recommendation.</p>
156.	<p>163 EASTCOTE ROAD 7881/APP/2025/2964 (<i>Agenda Item 13</i>)</p> <p>Demolition and rebuild of the front porch, single-storey wrap around side and rear extension with amendments to the fenestration</p> <p>Officers introduced the application, took Members through the plans and made a recommendation for approval.</p> <p>The officers' recommendation, was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, was unanimously agreed.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the application be approved as per officer recommendation.</p>
157.	<p>9 PASTURES MEAD 43892/APP/2026/52 (<i>Agenda Item 14</i>)</p> <p>Erection of single storey rear extension, and conversion of detached garage to a habitable use to use as a gym with WC</p> <p>Officers introduced the application, took Members through the plans and made a recommendation for approval.</p> <p>Members sought clarification regarding the gym use and how future residential change of use would be prevented. It was confirmed that any unauthorised change of use</p>

	<p>would be subject to enforcement action.</p> <p>The officers' recommendation, was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, was unanimously agreed.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the application be approved as per officer recommendation.</p>
	<p>The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 9.29 pm.</p>