

Minutes

BOROUGH PLANNING COMMITTEE

10 March 2022

Meeting held at Committee Room 5 - Civic Centre,
High Street, Uxbridge



HILLINGDON
LONDON

	<p>Committee Members Present: Councillors Henry Higgins (Chairman) Steve Tuckwell (Vice-Chairman) Shehryar Ahmad-Wallana Nicola Brightman Allan Kauffman</p> <p>Also Present: Councillor Philip Corthorne</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: James Rodger, Deputy Director of Planning and Regeneration Kerrie Munro, Planning Lawyer Alan Tilly, Transport Planning and Development Manager Fiona Rae, Planning Team Leader Nesha Burnham, Principle Planning Officer Steve Clarke, Democratic Services Officer</p>
39.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies for absence had been received from Councillor John Morse.</p>
40.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
41.	<p>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 15 February 2022 be approved as a correct record.</p>
42.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>The Chairman highlighted that Item 6 had been withdrawn from the meeting's agenda.</p>
43.	<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> <p>It was confirmed that all items were marked Part 1 and would be considered in public.</p>

44.	<p>18 ST EDWARDS AVENUE RUISLIP - 3255/APP/2021/4344 (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p>This item had been withdrawn prior to the meeting.</p>
45.	<p>GIDAR HOUSE, 13 THE CROSSWAY - 76909/APP/2021/4419 (<i>Agenda Item 7</i>)</p> <p>Officers introduced the application and drew Members' attention to the addendum which clarified the location of the new rear window which would serve a WC. The application was recommended for approval subject to a number of conditions to bring the proposals up to an acceptable standard.</p> <p>By way of written submission, the applicant addressed the Committee in response to a petition that had been submitted objecting to the application. Key points included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On matters of loss of privacy and overlooking from the side and rear windows, the applicant had agreed to install obscure glazing up to a height of 1.8 metres above internal floor level to preclude any overlooking or loss of privacy to neighbouring properties; • The only new rear window would be to serve ground floor toilets and these would be obscure glazed, therefore would not prejudice the development potential of neighbouring land; • Although there were garage door openings at the north side elevation, there was no internal garage space. This space had been used for offices and associated storage and therefore the proposals would not result in a loss of car parking space; • The officer's report noted that the removal of the signage and the relocation of the single entrance door would remove clutter from the front elevation which was considered beneficial to the local conservation area. <p>The Committee appreciated the level of scrutiny given by officers towards the application given the aesthetic of the building and its location within a conservation area. Members agreed that the conditions proposed by officers were comprehensive and effectively mitigated any prospective overlooking issues. The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the application be approved, as per the officer's recommendation.</p>
46.	<p>75A BRIDGE ROAD - 73647/APP/2021/951 (<i>Agenda Item 8</i>)</p> <p>Officers introduced the report noting that the application was recommended for refusal based on multiple factors; namely concerns about internal layout and close proximity resulting in a loss of privacy to near neighbours, concerns about the quality of the development, the excessive amount of parking provision, and the lack of a legal agreement to assure local residents that the new occupiers would not be eligible for parking permits.</p> <p>A petition had been submitted objecting to the application; a written statement from the lead petitioner was read out for the Committee. Key points included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns were raised regarding the application's increase in windows and proximity to the rear habitable rooms of 72 to 78 Bridge Road, prompting

potential issues relating to overlooking and loss of privacy;

- Concerns were also raised regarding the potential for contamination on site and it was stressed that a contamination report should have been submitted with the application;
- The plans for vehicular access were questioned and stated to increase the risk of accidents associated with entrance and egress of vehicles;
- The plans for parking spaces and manoeuvring space did not comply with the minimum dimensions required;
- Some inaccuracies were highlighted with the application, in that, the application had stated that the development was not within 20 metres of a watercourse, where the Fray's River in fact ran immediately behind the site.

The applicant was present and addressed the Committee. Key points included:

- The proposed development had previously been reduced from 5 residential units to 3 units on the advice of officers;
- There was a minimal amount of new windows to be installed, particularly those facing the adjacent residential properties.

Officers requested that Members consider possibly expanding on refusal reason one to ensure that, should the application be resubmitted, the applicant was aware that there would be a need to provide at least 6 metres of space between parking bays and any other obstructions to ensure there is sufficient manoeuvring space.

Members highlighted that, in the applications current form, there was too much overlooking out to the immediately adjacent properties; the Committee considered adding an additional reason for refusal to address the overlooking. Officers concurred with this and noted that to combat the overlooking issue, any application for residential dwellings would need to look out towards the Fray's River rather than towards the adjacent properties.

The officer's recommendation, inclusive of the expanded reasons for refusal, was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED:

- 1) That the application be refused;**
- 2) That delegated authority be given to the Deputy Director of Planning and Regeneration to expand on the first reason for refusal in that concerns were raised regarding the specificities of the parking layout; and**
- 3) That an additional reason for refusal be added with regard to concerns around overlooking towards the immediately adjacent residential properties.**

47. NEYLAND COURT - 76364/APP/2021/4604 (Agenda Item 9)

Officers introduced the application highlighting the recommendation for refusal based on four main reasons. That by virtue of its proximity, size, scale, bulk, massing and elevated height, the development would cause significant harm to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers; that the design of the proposed boundary treatment would negatively impact the residential amenities of the ground floor occupiers at Neyland Court; and that the proposed design for car parking spaces 13 to 16 would cause

unacceptable disturbances to the ground floor occupiers and would undermine the usability of the communal amenity space at Neyland Court.

Members attention was also drawn to the addendum which outlined additional public comments received after the Committee report had been published.

A petition had been submitted objecting to the application; a written statement from the lead petitioner was read out for the Committee. Key points included:

- The proposed development, due to its 5.6 metre height and close proximity to neighbouring dwellings, would significantly impact living conditions for neighbouring occupiers particularly with regard to loss of light and outlook;
- The proposed south-facing, non-obscured windows would cause a loss of privacy for the existing and future occupiers of Neyland Court;
- The application proposed an additional parking space at the expense of existing amenity space and a refuse store area; this would result in a further loss of privacy and communal amenity space.
- Concerns were raised that the current proposals for a non-residential office building would lead to a future change of use to residential units, resulting in overcrowding of the area.

Councillor Philip Corthorne, Ward Councillor for West Ruislip, was present and addressed the Committee. Key points raised included:

- The officer's recommendation for refusal was welcomed;
- The proposals would negatively impact residents in Neyland Court and Brickwall Lane;
- The application in front of Members, in addition to all previous related applications for the site, relied on a reduction in residential amenity space which was unacceptable;

The Committee noted the recent appeal history in relation to the application highlighting that the current proposals had not effectively addressed the concerns raised. Members encouraged the applicant to heed the advice given during those processes.

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

RESOLVED: That the application be refused as per the officer's recommendation.

The meeting, which commenced at 6.00 pm, closed at 6.47 pm.

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Steve Clarke on 01895250636. Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.