

## Minutes

### BOROUGH PLANNING COMMITTEE

13 June 2023

Meeting held at Committee Room 5 - Civic Centre



	<p><b>Committee Members Present:</b> Councillors Henry Higgins (Chairman) Farhad Choubedar Ekta Gohil Gursharan Mand Jagjit Singh Barry Nelson-West</p> <p><b>LBH Officers Present:</b> Sehar Arshad - Legal Advisor Katie Crosbie – Area Planning Service Manager (North) Noel Kelly – Assistant Director – Planning &amp; Regeneration Liz Penny - Democratic Services Officer Max Smith - Planning Team Leader Alan Tilly – Transport Planning and Development Manager</p>
3.	<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Darran Davies and from Councillor Raju Sansarpuri, with Councillor Barry Nelson-West substituting for the latter.</p>
4.	<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>
5.	<p><b>TO RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING DATED 10 MAY 2023</b> (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b> That the minutes of the meeting dated 10 May 2023 be agreed as an accurate record.</p>
6.	<p><b>TO RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING ON 11 MAY 2023 (AGM)</b> (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b> That the minutes of the meeting dated 11 May 2023 be agreed as an accurate record.</p>
7.	<p><b>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 5</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>

8.	<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 6</i>)</p> <p>It was confirmed that all items of business were marked Part I and would be considered in public.</p>
9.	<p><b>34, 36, 38 GREEN LANE, NORTHWOOD - 77897/APP/2023/602</b> (<i>Agenda Item 7</i>)</p> <p><b>Demolition of existing outbuilding and partial demolition of the ground floor of nos. 34 and 38. Erection of an outbuilding for use as a workshop. Installation of an external staircase to retained upper floor residential units. Amalgamation of ground floors of nos. 38 and 36 to form a combined retail unit including a new shopfront.</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the application which was recommended for refusal on the grounds that it would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area and would adversely affect the visual amenity of the street scene.</p> <p>A petition had been received in objection to the application and a representative of Northwood Residents' Association was in attendance to address the Committee on behalf of petitioners. Key points highlighted included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposal would not enhance the retail offering in Green Lane;</li> <li>• The proposed workshop would disrupt the cohesion of the current parade of shops;</li> <li>• The development would not be sympathetic to the local character of the Conservation Area;</li> <li>• Nos. 34-38 had constituted the first parade of shops on Green Lane and dated back more than a century;</li> <li>• The proposed development would cause harm to the vitality and viability of the town centre and would lead to the loss of 3 established businesses;</li> <li>• The proposed 40% reduction in the size of the unit would reduce the flexibility of the space and diversity of use;</li> <li>• The development could set a precedent – the cumulative impact of potential future applications had to be taken into consideration.</li> </ul> <p>Members supported the officers' recommendation for refusal noting that the proposal would result in harm to the character of the area. A second reason for refusal in relation to the shop front was suggested but it was confirmed that this was already incorporated within reason for refusal one.</p> <p>Members suggested an additional reason for refusal in respect of sustainable waste management highlighting the possible need to separate residential waste from commercial waste. It was confirmed that, in the event of an approval, this matter could be addressed by way of conditions.</p> <p>The Committee sought clarification regarding access for emergency vehicles. It was confirmed that the fire brigade had not been consulted on the application but there was sufficient room for a fire engine to pass.</p> <p>The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.</p>

**RESOLVED: That the application be refused.**

10.

**NEYLAND COURT, PEMBROKE ROAD, RUISLIP - 76364/APP/2023/321** (*Agenda Item 8*)

**Removal of the existing mansard roof, construction of additional two storeys along with front extensions and external alternations to create an additional 8 units with associated amenity.**

Officers introduced the application and highlighted the information in the addendum. It was noted that a similar scheme had been considered by the Committee in October 2022 and had been refused for nine reasons. The current proposed scheme had addressed some of the concerns raised but had failed to address others and five reasons for refusal remained.

It was considered that the proposed development would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area, would cause unacceptable harm to existing residents, failed to provide a suitable housing mix and would provide substandard accommodation in terms of external amenity space provision. For these reasons, the application was recommended for refusal.

A petition had been received in objection to the scheme and a written representation submitted by the lead petitioner was read out to the Committee for their consideration. Key points highlighted included:

- The proposal would result in overdevelopment. It would appear dominant and bulky and would be detrimental to the character of the local area which was on the fringe of the Conservation Area;
- The proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the living conditions of existing occupiers in terms of loss of outlook, loss of light, overshadowing, sense of enclosure and overbearing impact;
- The scheme would not provide sufficient amenity space to serve the existing and proposed dwellings.

A written submission had been received from Ward Councillor Philip Corthorne in support of petitioners and was read out to the Committee Members. Key points highlighted included:

- The development would result in wholly unacceptable loss of amenity which would blight neighbouring properties;
- The proposal was substantially the same as the previous application which had been refused;
- There was a long history of unacceptable planning applications at the site which represented a concerted effort to change fundamentally the character of the area;
- It was hoped that the Government's proposed increase in fees for planning applications would discourage multiple and spurious proposals which placed pressure on the planning authority and caused anxiety to the local community.

Members commented that the application appeared to be very similar to the previously refused scheme. It was unacceptable in terms of its scale and bulk and the proposed development would not accord with the street scene. Five robust reasons for refusal had been proposed by officers and Members were in agreement with these.

	<p>The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED: That the application be refused.</b></p>
11.	<p><b>PREZZO, HIGH STREET, RUISLIP - 16897/APP/2023/411</b> (<i>Agenda Item 9</i>)</p> <p><b>Demolition of UPVC conservatory, erection of replacement conservatory, replacement signage, external painting, creation of external terrace area and internal refurbishment (part retrospective)</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the application and highlighted the information in the addendum. It was noted that applications relating to Grade II listed building consent would be decided under delegated authority. The premises were Council owned hence the application was being considered by the Committee.</p> <p>Members heard that the proposal sought to demolish the conservatory at the site. The proposed development would have the same footprint as the existing. Officers felt the proposal would enhance the Ruislip Village Conservation Area hence the application was recommended for approval subject to the conditions set out in the report.</p> <p>In response to Members' requests for clarification, it was confirmed that York stone would be retained at the site. The Committee heard that the previous conservatory had been removed due to water ingress which had damaged the building. Officers had worked hard to reduce the size and height of the proposed new conservatory and were now satisfied with the proposal.</p> <p>Members raised no objections to the scheme. The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED: That the application be approved subject to the addendum and the conditions set out in the report.</b></p>
12.	<p><b>37 MIDHURST GARDENS, HILLINGDON - 77404/APP/2022/2171</b> (<i>Agenda Item 10</i>)</p> <p><b>Outline planning application for the partial demolition and retention of existing No.37 Midhurst Gardens and construction of new end-of-terrace two-bedroom dwelling set over two floors with associated parking, amenity and formation of new access (all matters reserved).</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the application which was recommended for approval as it was considered to present no undue harm to neighbouring amenities and would provide a good level of internal and external amenity space for future residents.</p> <p>In response to Members' requests for clarification, it was confirmed that updated plans had been received and the first-floor element would not impact adversely on light provision at the existing property.</p> <p>Members welcomed the proposal noting that it complied with planning guidelines and would contribute positively to the Borough's Housing supply. The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED: That the application be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report.</b></p>

13.	<p><b>PEMBROKE HOUSE, 5-9 PEMBROKE ROAD, RUISLIP 38324/APP/2022/2001</b> (Agenda Item 11)</p> <p><b>Variation of Condition 2 of planning permission ref. 38324/APP/2019/4066, dated 13/03/2020 (Erection of detached building to accommodate office accommodation above existing parking) to amend elevations, infill of undercroft and provision of wc / shower room and kitchen to first floor offices (part retrospective).</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the application noting that planning permission for the office building to the rear of Pembroke House had been granted at Appeal and could therefore not be re-visited.</p> <p>Officers noted that the development had not been built in accordance with the original plans hence a breach of conditions notice had been served which had resulted in the submission of the current application.</p> <p>It was confirmed that planning enforcement officers had previously investigated reports of residential use at the premises but no evidence of this had been established. Members heard that conditions were proposed to ensure the development remained residential in the future. Revised drawings showed the removal of the existing hob and oven from the kitchen as these facilities were of a residential nature. The shower would be retained as this was considered appropriate for an office space.</p> <p>A written submission had been received from Ward Councillor Philip Corthorne and was read out to the Committee. Councillor Corthorne expressed his concern that the development would be residential accommodation in all but name given the inclusion of a kitchen, shower and Juliet balcony. He supported the condition restricting the future use of the building to office accommodation only.</p> <p>Members raised no concerns regarding the retention of the shower room which could be used for office staff. They welcomed the inclusion of firm conditions to ensure that the development would be used only as an office and not for residential purposes.</p> <p>The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED: That the application be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report.</b></p>
	<p>The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 7.48 pm.</p>

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