

## Minutes

### BOROUGH PLANNING COMMITTEE

12 July 2022

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



HILLINGDON  
LONDON

	<p><b>Committee Members Present:</b> Councillors Henry Higgins (Chairman), Steve Tuckwell (Vice-Chairman), Farhad Choubedar, Ekta Gohil, Gursharan Mand, Raju Sansarpuri and Jagjit Singh</p> <p><b>LBH Officers Present:</b> Anisha Teji (Democratic Services Officer), James Rodger (Deputy Director of Planning and Regeneration), Alan Tilly (Transport Planning and Development Manager), Katie Crosbie (Planning Team Leader), Nesha Burnham (Principal Planning Officer), Fiona Rae (Planning Team Leader) and Glen Egan (Legal Advisor)</p>
21.	<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>There were no apologies for absence.</p>
22.	<p><b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING</b> (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
23.	<p><b>TO SIGN AND 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 21 June 22 be approved.</p>
24.	<p><b>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
25.	<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.</p>
	<p>The Deputy Director of Planning and Regeneration was thanked for their service and contribution to the planning committee.</p> <p>The Deputy Director of Planning and Regeneration had been an asset to the Borough and were wished well for the future.</p>

26.

**102 WEYMOUTH ROAD - 22898/APP/2021/3312** (*Agenda Item 6*)

**That the application be approved as per officer's recommendation Change of use of a dwelling house (Use Class C3) to a four-bed home where specialist care is provided for residents (Class C2)**

Officers introduced the application and made a recommendation for approval.

A petitioner in objection of the proposed development addressed the Committee and referred to photographs that were circulated to Members and officers prior to the meeting. It was submitted that there had been a lack of transparency regarding the nature of the business for the childrens home. The house was originally built as two-bedroom property with a small garden. There had already been extensive development at the rear. Concerns about a long history of anti-social behaviour in the area were raised and a recent incident of drug dealing had been reported to the police. It was noted that this area had been listed as an area of priority by the Charville Ward Panel and police. There were already eight houses on a narrow road with limited parking space and the development did not meet parking policies. It was submitted that the development would cause road safety concerns and would generate more traffic and noise. Traffic and parking was already an issue due to the nearby school and park. It was noted that there were already childrens centres nearby Weymouth Road.

The agent for the application addressed the Committee and outlined the proposal. It was noted that the applicant had worked closely with officers, residents and local consultees since August 2021 to address any concerns and make this application acceptable. The new small residential care facility would meet an established need in the Borough. The principle of the development was considered acceptable and would create a caring environment. It was noted that occupiers would have access to private rear amenity space, communal space and there would be no adverse noise impacts on neighbouring properties. There would also be two members of staff onsite 24 hours, 7 days a week with a manager on site between 09:00 – 17:00. Two car parking spaces had been included as part of the proposal and this had been considered as sufficient. Additional car space could also be easily accommodated by the nearby area and three cycle spaces had also been proposed. The Committee was reassured that the facility would provide long term care to vulnerable children and Members were urged to approve the application.

In response to Member clarification questions regarding resident concerns about noise and ASB, it was noted that there would be two members of staff on site 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.

Councillor Darran Davies, Ward Councillor for Charville addressed the Committee and supported the residents petition against the change of use. It was noted that there were 10 special provision properties in Charville and since the use of these properties, there had been a vast increase in anti-social behaviour. The proposal was already on an oversubscribed road and would add to the parking and traffic congestion issues. It was submitted that the parking provision suggested was inadequate and concerns were raised regarding the traffic survey. There was a shortage of four-bed homes in the Borough and the Committee was asked to consider the residents and continue to put them first.

The Legal Advisor advised the Committee to make its decision based on the information before it and to avoid making any assumptions regarding anti-social

behaviour. There had been no objections from the police or any other council departments regarding anti-social behaviour.

In response to Member questions about the adequacy of two car spaces and the removal of a four- bed house, it was explained that local plan standards had been considered alongside the wider impacts through transport assessments that had been undertaken. A third car could be parked on street and this was not enough to form a refusal reason. The survey had also been undertaken in the evening to gauge real impacts of the parking situation. In terms of the removal of a four-bed house, this had been weighed against the introduction of a needed care facility. It was also noted that there was no identified amenity space needed for this use and there was also a park nearby.

Although Members supported the provision of the facility, they were keen to safeguard the interests of residents. It was advised that condition 4 could be strengthened to state that the building shall only be used a four-bedroom residential care home for no more than four children aged 11 – 17 years old.

The officer's recommendation, inclusive of strengthening condition 4 to include that the building shall only be used a four-bedroom residential care home for no more than four children aged 11 – 17 years old, was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, was unanimously agreed.

**RESOLVED: That the application be approved as per officer recommendation subject to strengthening condition 4.**

27. **170 HAREFIELD ROAD - 23469/APP/2022/144** (*Agenda Item 7*)

**Erection of new 3-bedroom bungalow with dormers and rooflights serving accommodation in the roof, on land to the front of existing dwelling.**

Officers introduced the application and noted that this application was at appeal. The Committee's decision would form the Council's Statement of case.

A petitioner in objection of the proposed development addressed the Committee. The petition had been signed by 29 residents and concerns were raised regarding overlooking, loss of amenity and the detrimental impact to the character to the area. The petitioner supported the officer's recommendation. The proposal was a four-bed house with a previous parking turnaround area which had now been replaced with two car park spaces. However, the inclusion of the high fence restricted the drivers view which caused unintended consequences for neighbouring properties. Questions were also raised about the two car parking spaces, one being EV and no option to reverse which could cause safety concerns.

The agent for the application addressed the Committee and referred to handouts that were circulated to Members and officers prior to the meeting. Handouts were also made available at the meeting. It was noted that this application had been put forward as a non-determination appeal to the Planning Inspector to reach a decision. It was submitted that Harefield Road provided a rich mix of different properties, and it was impossible to find a typical pattern as other properties were also out of character of the area. The frontage of 172 was a shared driveway making it back land property and the new dwelling would reinforce the existing street line. It was submitted that the Council

had a history of resisting development on Harefield Road and there were multiple examples of properties that caused overlooking and loss of privacy. Views from ground floor openings were naturally obscured by site boundaries while those from the first floor could be easily mitigated. It was also submitted that amendments to the application could be made however there had been no opportunity to address any points where standards in building regulations had not been met. The scheme had been recommended for refusal without thorough assessment.

Councillor Tony Burles, Ward Councillor for Uxbridge addressed the Committee and was in support of residents and the officer's recommendation. It was submitted that this would be an inappropriate development and would not enhance the area. Disappointment was expressed regarding the lack of refusal reasons on highways grounds as this would strengthen the refusal recommendation.

The Deputy Director of Planning and Regeneration provided further context on the site and highlighted the three refusal reasons provided in the report.

Officers advised the Committee of an additional refusal reason as the in and out access of the driveway was counter to the Council's vehicle crossover policy.

The Legal Advisor advised the Committee that a decision needed to be made on the plans put before the Committee, to assist the Inspectorate in their decision making.

The officer's recommendation, inclusive of the additional refusal reason relating to highways arrangements and amending refusal reason 3 to remove the reference to diagram 27, was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

**RESOLVED: That the Planning Inspectorate be advised that had the application not been subject to a non-determination appeal the Committee would have refused the application as per the officer recommendation, but subject to an additional refusal reason relating to highways arrangements and amending refusal reason 3 to remove the reference to diagram 27.**

28. **72 HAREFIELD ROAD - 25767/APP/2022/1400** (*Agenda Item 8*)

**Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of building to provide 3 x 1-bed and 6 x 2-bed flats with associated parking and amenity space.**

Officers introduced the application and made a recommendation for refusal.

A representative on behalf of the petition addressed the Committee and referred to photographs that were circulated to Members and officers prior to the meeting. It was submitted that the petition had been signed by 71 residents, the development was unwanted and was totally unsuitable given the location. It was highlighted that this was the demolishment of another family dwelling, changed the character of the area, an overdevelopment of the site with 9 units/15 bedrooms and there was no provision for any family space. It was reiterated that there would be a detrimental impact on the traffic conditions on Harefield Road and a threat to pedestrian safety. Concerns were also raised regarding the number of parking spaces proposed, access to the site particularly during the construction stage, loss of light and a deterioration of air quality. The Committee was urged to approve the officer's recommendation.

Neither the applicant nor the agent were in attendance.

	<p>Councillor Tony Burles, Ward Councillor for Uxbridge addressed the Committee and supported the petition. It was submitted that there would be a detrimental effect on neighbouring properties. Disappointment was expressed regarding the lack of refusal reasons on highways grounds.</p> <p>Further to Member questions regarding road safety and highways concerns, officers explained that no refusal reasons were provided on highways grounds based on previous decisions and appeal.</p> <p>Given the loss of a family dwelling, concerns of overlooking and the size of development, the officer's recommendation was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED: That the application be refused as per officer's recommendation subject to any amendments in the addendum.</b></p>
29.	<p><b>THE LOUNGE BAR AND RESTAURANT , DAWLEY ROAD - 10884/APP/2021/3590</b> <i>(Agenda Item 9)</i></p> <p><b>Change of use of former public house premises (Sui Generis) into a place of worship / community centre (Use Class F.1/F.2), including ancillary residential accommodation on the first floor and demolition of outbuilding and side lean-to additions to create associated parking and landscaping (Part Retrospective).</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the application, highlighted the addendum and made a recommendation for refusal.</p> <p>The Committee raised concerns on highways grounds, particularly given the number of people that would be using the property. Traffic and road safety was already an issue in this area. Special occasions where more people would be likely to attend the property would add to this issue causing increased traffic congestion, concerns of pedestrian and road safety and restricting pedestrian visibility. It was also noted that the access of Network Rail sites was continuously blocked which impacted free flowing traffic. The plans submitted did not cover the risks and concerns raised.</p> <p>The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED: That the application be refused as per officer's recommendation and refusal reasons detailed in the addendum.</b></p>
30.	<p><b>2 GLEBE AVENUE - 2771/APP/2022/1051</b> <i>(Agenda Item 10)</i></p> <p><b>RESOLVED: That the application be approved as per officer's Change of use of ground floor from solicitors office (Use Class E(c)(ii)) to hot food takeaway (Use Class sui generis) and installation of extract duct.</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the application and made a recommendation for approval. It was reported that there had been four neighbouring objections that had been addressed in the report.</p> <p>The Committee requested clarification on the need for an informative around the extract flue arrangements. Members were advised that the application had been</p>

	<p>assessed by the technical officers and no concerns had been raised. The Committee also welcomed the Prevention of Litter informative that required businesses to clear up litter and implement measures to prevent the land being littered again.</p> <p>The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED: That the application be approved as per officer's recommendation.</b></p>
31.	<p><b>3-5 STATION APPROACH - 77197/APP/2022/1129</b> (<i>Agenda Item 11</i>)</p> <p><b>Change of use from Car workshop/Tyre centre to Sui Generis (MOT centre)</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the application and made a recommendation for approval.</p> <p>The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED: That the application be approved as per officer's recommendation.</b></p>
	<p>The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 8.54 pm.</p>

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