

Minutes

BOROUGH PLANNING COMMITTEE

6 April 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, Allan Kauffman, John Morse (Opposition Lead), Philip Corthorne and Mohinder Birah</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: Anisha Teji (Democratic Services Officer), Roz Johnson (Planning Services Manager), Kerrie Munro (Legal Adviser), Alan Tilly (Transport Planning and Development Manager) and Fiona Rae (Planning Team Leader)</p>
48.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Nicola Brightman with Councillor Philip Corthorne substituting.</p> <p>Apologies for absence were also received from Councillor Jazz Dhillon with Councillor Mohinder Birah substituting.</p>
49.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>Councillor Steve Tuckwell declared a non-pecuniary interest in agenda item 8 – 182 The Fairway Ruislip (23977/APP/2021/2040) as he had prior involvement with Ward Councillors regarding the site. He did not vote and left the room during discussion of the item.</p> <p>Councillor Shehryar Ahmad Wallana declared a non-pecuniary interest in agenda items 9 - 2 Westbourne Parade (5778/APP/2021/3809) and 10 – 2 Westbourne Parade (5778/ADV/2021/54) as he had prior involvement with the applicant regarding the site. He did not vote and left the room during discussion of the item.</p>
50.	<p>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE MEETINGS DATED 10 MARCH 2022 (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting on 10 March 2022 be approved as an accurate record.</p>
51.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>

52. **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** (*Agenda Item 5*)

It was confirmed that all items would be considered in public.

53. **FORMER TARA KINDERGARTEN, CROSS ROAD UXBRIDGE - 62106/APP/2021/2555** (*Agenda Item 6*)

Demolition of the existing building (use class F1) and construction of a new block comprising of 6 residential apartments and a community use space (Use Class F1, F2, E(e) and (f)) with associated parking and landscaping works (change in the description of development (18/1/22))

Officers introduced the application and made a recommendation for refusal.

A petitioner in objection of the proposed development addressed the Committee. It was submitted that the residents of Rockingham Bridge Conservation area fully supported the reasons for refusal. The report detailed both national and local policies on why the area should be preserved, the building had architectural interest and was an important community asset. It was noted that the application would see the building demolished and be replaced by a standard urban three-story flat roof structure. The proposed density and footprint of the development was greater than that found in the area and the development did not respect the historic character and appearance of the local area. The former telephone exchange was unique and it was submitted that this piece of Uxbridge was worth keeping.

The agent for the application addressed the Committee and referred to photographs that were circulated to Members and officers prior to the meeting. It was noted that the agent had worked on this application since February 2021 and worked with the LPA on the design proposal. The current building was located between a conservation area and city centre scale, and there was a mixture of housing types. The development aimed to meet the future needs of residents and provided three opportunity factors that would improve the area. The site would provide six above standard homes with ample amenity space and discourage overlooking to existing residents. The proposal was a fully sustainable development that considered local public transport and renewable energy sources contributing to Hillingdon's zero carbon targets and it was a community asset that had easy access to local amenities. The proposal bridged the gap between two landscapes, the massing observed the local character and the design was of high quality. It was submitted that the development would propose interesting architecture, allow good daylight and sunlight, windows would prevent overlooking to neighbours and each home would have private amenity. The Committee was asked to consider the positives of the application, the needs of future generations of residents, the new quality space provided for community and the sustainable development bearing in mind climate change principles.

In response to Member questions, it was reported that the trees matter had been addressed through communications with the Tree Preservation Officer and the amenity space offered, including private balconies was considered satisfactory. Although no family accommodation had been included, it was noted that this was acceptable given the available footprint and location of the site.

The Legal Officer advised the Committee that an additional reason for refusal in relation to amenity space could be included provided there were sufficient reasons. The

Committee was reminded that this was a fresh application and Members were asked to consider the application based on the information before it. Members thanked officers for the comprehensive report. Although there were good aspects of the application such as the sustainable resources, the officer's recommendation was moved, seconded, and unanimously agreed.

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

54. **16 DEERINGS DRIVE, PINNER - 40468/TRE/2022/14** (*Agenda Item 7*)

To remove One Oak T14 on TPO 363

Officers introduced the application and made a recommendation for refusal.

By way of written submission, a petitioner in objection of the proposed development addressed the Committee. The refusal reasons in the report were supported and it was explained that TPO 363 was created in 1980 when St. Michaels School closed and the land was destined for a housing development. The line of magnificent red oaks played an important role in providing a green corridor between Deerings Drive and Gerrard Gardens. The infill estate Deerings Drive was designed in a manner to keep important trees on the former school site. It was submitted that mature trees benefited wildlife, helped reduce pollution and were vital against global warming. The Committee was asked to endorse the recommendation and refuse the application.

Neither the applicant nor agent were in attendance at the meeting.

In the absence of any new material information, the officer's recommendation was moved, seconded, and unanimously agreed.

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

55. **182 THE FAIRWAY, RUISLIP - 23977/APP/2021/2040** (*Agenda Item 8*)

Two storey side extension, two storey /first floor infill rear extensions and subdivision into 2 self-contained family dwellings.

Officers introduced the application and made a recommendation for approval. An additional condition in relation to the reinstatement of the footway at the redundant access onto Mount Pleasant was put forward by officers. It was also highlighted that the report contained a condition in relation to prohibiting the use of the proposed dwellings as an HMO without planning permission.

By way of written submission, a petitioner in objection of the proposed development addressed the Committee on behalf of 38 petitioners and 10 individual households. A background of the site was provided and it was noted that extensions proposed as part of this development had previous planning permission. It was explained that consent granted in April 2021 ignored a number of important factors and the majority of the petitioners were not consulted about the application. It was submitted that the proposed development was not in keeping with the street scene, the conversion to a pair of semis would entail a permanent loss of character and identity for what has been a landmark house in the area since the 1930s. There was likely to be an increase in cars causing increased congestion and concerns about public safety. The Committee was requested to refuse consent for the conversion to a pair of semis and if legislation

permitted, also consider revoking the previous consent for the large extensions.

The applicant addressed the Committee, and it was noted that the property was located at an angle to its immediate neighbours. The house had a wide frontage and sat on a generous plot. A previous application had been granted planning permission, however this application used the footprint and height as permitted by that previous consent to create one pair of semidetached house. The building could be subdivided easily with little impact on the street scene and neighbours. The concerns regarding the scale and character were noted however the development used the same footprint, height and volume previously consented by the Council in 2021. It was confirmed that there was no intention to convert the property to an HMO and there were no objections from highways. The proposal complied with housing standards and provided generous amenity space and comfortable accommodation. The Committee was asked to approve the application as per officer's recommendation.

Although there appeared to be a fair quantum of development on this site, it was noted that the development complied with policies, created an additional family home and was acceptable in visual terms.

The Committee considered that this was a good application that provided an additional family unit. There was also adequate parking and no detriment on the street scene. Members welcomed the condition in respect of the prohibition of conversion to a HMO.

The Legal Adviser requested reasoning to be provided for the highway condition and the approved reasons would follow in writing.

Subject to the additional condition in respect of the footway in the interests of highways safety, the officer's recommendation was moved, seconded, and unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved as per officer's recommendation subject to the addition of the condition reinstating the public footway.

56. **2 WESTBOURNE PARADE, UXBRIDGE ROAD HILLINGDON - 5778/APP/2021/3809**
(Agenda Item 9)

Change of use on the first floor from office (Class E) to one studio flat (Class C3), new door to front and replacement of shop front from community store to beauty salon (sui generis) and other in Use Class E.

Officers introduced the application and made a recommendation for approval. A verbal update was provided to amend the wording of condition 5 to clarify that it related to the 'commercial' premises.

During Member discussions, it was confirmed that the width of the internal doors for the beauty treatment rooms was covered by building regulations and an informative could be included to specify that the width of the doors should allow for disabled access.

Subject to the amendment to condition 5 to include reference to 'commercial' premises and the additional informative in respect of the width of doors, the officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved as per officer's recommendation, subject to the amendment to condition 5 to include 'commercial' premises and the additional informative in respect of the width of doors.

57.	<p>2 WESTBOURNE PARADE, UXBRIDGE ROAD, HILLINGDON - 5778/ADV/2021/54 (Agenda Item 10)</p> <p>Installation of 1 no. internally illuminated fascia sign and 1 no. internally illuminated projecting sign.</p> <p>Agenda item 10 was heard and discussed in conjunction with agenda item 9. The minutes for both items have been recorded under agenda item 9.</p> <p>The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and unanimously agreed.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the application be approved as per officer's recommendation.</p>
58.	<p>1 - 3 BAKERS ROAD, UXBRIDGE - 72219/APP/2021/1535 (Agenda Item 11)</p> <p>Change of use of first floor from gymnasium to 1 x 2-bed and 1 x 1-bed self-contained flats (Use Class C3)</p> <p>Officers introduced the application and made a recommendation for approval subject to section 106 agreement.</p> <p>The Committee noted that the application included a contribution in lieu of affordable housing, which was acceptable.</p> <p>The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and unanimously agreed.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the application be approved subject to section 106 as per officer's recommendation.</p>
	<p>The meeting, which commenced at 6.00 pm, closed at 6.59 pm.</p>

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Anisha Teji on 01895 277655 or ateji@hillingdon.gov.uk . Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.