

## Minutes

### BOROUGH PLANNING COMMITTEE

5 October 2023

Meeting held at Committee Room 5 - Civic Centre



	<p><b>Committee Members Present:</b> Councillors Henry Higgins (Chairman) Wayne Bridges Farhad Choubedar Ekta Gohil Gursharan Mand Raju Sansarpuri Jagjit Singh</p> <p><b>LBH Officers Present:</b> Sehar Arshad, Legal Advisor Christos Chrysanthou, Planning Officer Katie Crosbie, Area Planning Service Manager Ana Griffiths, Transport Officer Roz Johnson, Head of Development Management and Building Control Liz Penny, Democratic Services Officer Max Smith, Planning Team Leader Jimmy Walsh, Legal Advisor</p>
34.	<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Darran Davies with Councillor Wayne Bridges substituting.</p>
35.	<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>
36.	<p><b>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING</b> (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>It was noted that, in the minutes of the meeting dated 5 September 2023, Cllr Jagjit Singh had been named twice in the attendance list. Democratic Services would rectify this error.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b> That the minutes of the meeting dated 5 September 2023 be agreed, subject to the removal of one of the references to Cllr Jagjit Singh in the attendance list.</p>
37.	<p><b>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>

38.	<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 of business were marked Part I and would be considered in public.</p>
39.	<p><b>CHILDREN'S HOME, CHARVILLE LANE, HAYES - 26544/APP/2023/2303</b> (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p><b>Redevelopment of an existing Children's Home to provide a new build residential institution development (Use Class C2). Erection of 3 no. 2 storey buildings, providing accommodation for 12 young people and 6 household staff and an educational building; hard and soft landscaping, communal and private garden areas and a Multi-Use Games Area.</b></p> <p>Planning officers introduced the application and highlighted the information in the addendum. Members were informed that the application site was situated in an area which was at high risk of flooding. The existing Children's Home currently provided accommodation for 13 children and 14 staff. The plan was to demolish the existing building and replace it with terraced houses to house a total of 18 people. It was anticipated that the redevelopment would not impact negatively on neighbours. 20 parking spaces were to be provided including two disabled parking spaces. No objections had been raised by the Highways Team and it was felt that the new development would harmonise with the current street scene. Protected trees would be maintained. The application was recommended for approval subject to the conditions in the report and the information in the addendum.</p> <p>A petition in objection to the proposal had been received and the lead petitioner addressed the Committee on behalf of the petitioners. Key points raised included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the current Children's Centre was a single storey building and it was to be replaced by 3 x large houses;</li> <li>• half of the rooms were to house unaccompanied children under the age of 18;</li> <li>• the proposed changes constituted a material change and would result in overdevelopment of the site;</li> <li>• the new development would include 6 kitchens and 6 living rooms which was an intensification of the existing use;</li> <li>• residents of Heatherwood Drive, which was situated very close to the application site, would be subjected to increased levels of noise, traffic and pollution – some residents were elderly and vulnerable;</li> <li>• the dust created during construction would present a risk to health, especially for those residents who had breathing difficulties;</li> <li>• increased traffic would add to congestion in Charville Lane; and</li> <li>• residents were worried about their own safety as some of the children were reported to have behavioural problems.</li> </ul> <p>The applicant and the agent were in attendance to answer questions from the Committee but there were none.</p> <p>Charville Ward Councillors were in attendance and addressed the Committee in support of residents. The following concerns were raised:</p>

- the application would result in increased levels of noise and traffic and additional pressure on parking. Traffic in Charville Lane was already problematic and cars often parked close to the junction with Bury Avenue;
- further changes to the proposed development could be forthcoming at a later stage;
- the scale of the proposal was excessive;
- the MUGA pitch should be unlit and conditioned for use by residents exclusively;
- the Travel Plan needed to be strengthened to ensure parking on site was sufficient;
- refuse arrangements appeared inadequate;
- the Construction Management Plan should include preventative measures to protect neighbours from dust; and
- additional tree planting was requested.

In response to the concerns raised by petitioners and Ward Councillors, officers advised the Committee that the proposal did not represent an intensification of use as the new development would continue to operate as a children's care home and would house less residents than the current one. Officers believed the new development would be a better form of accommodation which would provide sufficient private amenity space for the young people and the staff.

In terms of noise, it was anticipated that the level of noise would remain unchanged and would be commensurate with the existing. Dust pollution concerns were addressed in the Construction Management Plan and refuse arrangements at the site were deemed to be adequate but would be revisited. Parking matters had been assessed by the Transport and Highways Team and no concerns raised. If required, the MUGA pitch could be conditioned to ensure it was unlit and was for the use of residents only.

In response to questions from Members, it was confirmed that the Children's Home would only house children under the age of 18.

Members acknowledged that it was a sensitive topic and thanked officers for their thorough report. The Committee agreed that the project was needed and acknowledged that it was already heavily conditioned in the officer's report. The inclusion of a condition in relation to the MUGA pitch was supported – this would ensure the pitch would be for the use of residents only; it was not felt that a time restriction on its use was required as weather and light would dictate this.

Members supported the inclusion of an additional condition to ensure the use of planting to mitigate carbon dioxide emissions.

The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously agreed subject to the addition of the two agreed conditions in relation to the use of the MUGA pitch and planting.

**RESOLVED:**

- 1. That the application be approved subject to the addendum and the conditions in the officer's report;**
- 2. That delegated authority be granted to planning officers to draft an additional condition to require planting to mitigate carbon dioxide emissions; and**

**3. That delegated authority be granted to planning officers to draft an additional condition restricting the use of the MUGA pitch to residents only.**

40. **28 JACKS LANE, HAREFIELD - 76265/APP/2023/1128** (*Agenda Item 7*)

**Alterations of garage roof, erection of a three storey side extension with balcony and balustrade, alterations to fenestration and demolition of chimney.**

Officers introduced the application noting that the application site lay in a semi-rural location within the Coppermill Lock Conservation Area. Planning permission had previously been refused due to concerns about the impact on neighbours at number 27 Jacks Lane. The current scheme had reduced the scale of the proposed development significantly and the application was now recommended for approval.

A petition in objection to the application had been received. The lead petitioner was in attendance and addressed the Committee on behalf of petitioners. Key points highlighted included:

- The proposed development would create a 6-bed house which could potentially be used as an HMO in the future;
- The previous application had been refused due to its impact on a first-floor habitable room window at number 27 and the harm this would cause to neighbouring living conditions;
- A subsequent appeal had been refused for reasons including its failure to comply with Policies DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part Two;
- At appeal the Planning Inspector had identified additional harm to neighbours which had not been addressed in the current application;
- The proposed reduction in scale would not be clear of the 45-degree line hence would not resolve the impact on outlook from the first floor bedroom window at number 27 Jacks Lane;
- The glazed office window had not been replaced but had been temporarily covered with a privacy film which had now been peeled off;
- The height, bulk and proximity to the boundary of the proposed development remained unchanged and would still cause significant harm to neighbours.

The applicant was also in attendance and addressed the Committee Members. Key points highlighted included:

- The applicant and his partner had six children between them and wanted to create a family home;
- At present there was an 8m gap between numbers 27 and 28 which was larger than the gaps between other properties in Jacks Lane – once the extension had been completed, the gap would still measure nearly 5m;
- In January, the Planning Committee had generally been in support of the application – the only concerns raised had been in respect of loss of outlook;
- The applicant had worked closely with planning officers to reduce the proposed development and ensure it would comply with planning policy;
- The current proposal would have a minimal impact on neighbours – the applicant did not wish to cause any disruption;
- The applicant was disappointed with the reaction of neighbours. He wanted to create a family home and had no intention of using it as an HMO in the future;

- Number 27 was a beautiful property with a large frontage and outlook over the canal. The extension at number 28 would not impact on number 27 as the house was recessed. No house on Jacks Lane had complete privacy;
- The occupants at number 27 had installed a security camera which looked directly into the applicant's back garden;
- The applicant had behaved with dignity, gone through the planning process and felt he had arrived at a plan which would suit everyone.

Ward Councillor Martin Goddard was in attendance and spoke in support of petitioners. He noted that an earlier application had been refused in January and, at appeal, the Inspector had identified two other matters of concern. The current application needed to be considered in isolation and all possible reasons for refusal taken into account. It appeared that concerns regarding the 45 degree angle had not been addressed and officers had not attended the site to check the measurements.

In response to their requests for clarification, Members were advised that the reduction in scale would be clear of the 45-degree angle therefore it was considered that the proposed development would not impact on the outlook at number 27. There was no specific evidence to suggest that the 45-degree angle was incorrect. The houses in Jacks Lane were unusual and the 45-degree angle would not automatically apply therefore measurements had not been taken in this case.

At the request of Members, it was agreed that the application could be conditioned to ensure it would not be used as an HMO in the future.

It was confirmed that the balcony would be at a similar level to the existing one.

Members were concerned that the proposed development would not respect the privacy of neighbours hence a site visit was proposed. The proposal to conduct a site visit to clarify the matter of the 45-degree angle was moved, seconded and unanimously approved.

The matter would be considered again at a future Planning Committee. Should petitioners wish to speak again, a new petition would need to be submitted.

**RESOLVED: That a decision on the application be deferred to allow for a site visit.**

41. **161 RYEFIELD AVENUE, HILLINGDON - 4108/APP/2023/1445** (*Agenda Item 8*)

**Partial retention of outbuilding for use as ancillary storage and staff room for the existing shop (partially retrospective)**

Officers introduced the application and highlighted the information in the addendum. The proposal sought to retain a reduced-scale outbuilding for use as storage and a small staff room for the ground floor commercial premises. The existing outbuilding which had been built without planning permission would be partially demolished. The application had been called in by Ward Councillor Alan Chapman. Officers had liaised with the Councillor and his concerns had been addressed via the conditions proposed in the addendum. The Councillor had since withdrawn his call-in request and the application was recommended for approval.

In response to questions from the Committee, it was confirmed that the reduced size of the outbuilding was considered acceptable. A 3-month window would be allowed for

	<p>completion of the works.</p> <p>The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously approved subject to the addendum and the conditions proposed in the report.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED: That the application be approved subject to the addendum and the conditions set out in the officer's report.</b></p>
42.	<p><b>95-97 WILLOW TREE LANE, YEADING - 70575/APP/2023/1743</b> (<i>Agenda Item 9</i>)</p> <p><b>Temporary change of use of a pair of semi-detached dwellings (Class C3 use) to a Children's Home (Class C2 use for maximum of 2 residents with support staff) and all associated external works.</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the application which was linked to agenda item 6. No internal changes were proposed. A temporary 1.8m high fence and gates would be installed for security purposes and removed at a later stage. The application was supported by colleagues in Social Care and was recommended for approval.</p> <p>Members welcomed the application noting that this type of accommodation was needed. Officers agreed to check the planting arrangements.</p> <p>The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously approved subject to the conditions in the report.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED: That the application be approved subject to the conditions set out in the officer's report.</b></p>
43.	<p><b>CIVIC CENTRE, HIGH STREET, UXBRIDGE - 14805/APP/2023/2336</b> (<i>Agenda Item 10</i>)</p> <p><b>The replacement of a failed flat roof covering (behind parapet walls); replacement of defective pv panels on a like-for-like basis. Joinery, brickwork and concrete repairs; the replacement of single glazed Crittall windows with double glazed Crittall windows. Installation of air source heat pumps to service yard, with associated screening, and removal of a suspended ceiling within the function suite, all within the Middlesex Suite.</b></p> <p>Officers presented the report which was recommended for approval. Members welcomed the proposal and raised no objections.</p> <p>The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously approved, subject to the conditions in the report.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED: That the application be approved subject to the conditions set out in the officer's report.</b></p>
44.	<p><b>CIVIC CENTRE, HIGH STREET, UXBRIDGE (LISTED BUILDING CONSENT) - 14805/APP/2023/2337</b> (<i>Agenda Item 11</i>)</p> <p><b>The replacement of a failed flat roof covering (behind parapet walls); replacement of defective pv panels on a like-for-like basis. Joinery, brickwork and concrete repairs; the replacement of single glazed Crittall windows with</b></p>

	<p><b>double glazed Crittall windows. Installation of air source heat pumps to service yard, with associated screening, and removal of a suspended ceiling within the function suite, all within the Middlesex Suite. (Application for Listed Building Consent).</b></p> <p>Officers presented the report which was recommended for approval. It was noted that the Civic Centre was a Grade II listed building. Conservation Officers had been consulted and had felt that the public benefit outweighed the small harm to the listed building.</p> <p>Members welcomed the proposal and raised no objections.</p> <p>The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously approved, subject to the conditions in the report.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED: That the application be approved subject to the conditions set out in the officer's report.</b></p>
45.	<p><b>TPO 803, FRAYS AVENUE, LAWN AVENUE, WREN DRIVE AND LAND TO THE EAST</b> (<i>Agenda Item 12</i>)</p> <p><b>Tree Preservation Order No. 803 (TPO 803): Trees Situated on Garden City, West Drayton (ASCL).</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the report noting that two objections to TPO 803 had been received. The concerns raised had been addressed in the officer's report. It was confirmed that the tree could be pruned subject to approval being formally requested and granted.</p> <p>Members had no concerns. The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously approved.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED: That the TPO be confirmed with amendments as set out in the officer's report.</b></p>
	<p>The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 8.17 pm.</p>

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