

## Minutes

### HILLINGDON PLANNING COMMITTEE

14 February 2024

Meeting held at Committee Room 5 - Civic Centre



	<p><b>Committee Members Present:</b> Councillors Henry Higgins (Chair) Adam Bennett (Vice-Chair) Farhad Choubedar Elizabeth Garelick Barry Nelson-West Jagjit Singh</p> <p><b>LBH Officers Present:</b> Chris Brady, Area Team Leader Michael Briginshaw, Deputy Team Leader Katie Crosbie, Area Planning Service Manager - North Natalie Fairclough, Legal Advisor Ana Griffiths, Highways Officer Ed Laughton, Area Planning Service Manager - Central &amp; South Liz Penny, Democratic Services Officer Haydon Richardson, Deputy Team Leader Jimmy Walsh, Legal Advisor</p>
45.	<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Roy Chamdal, from Councillor Darran Davies (with Councillor Farhad Choubedar substituting) and from Councillor Gursharan Mand (with Councillor Barry Nelson-West substituting).</p>
46.	<p><b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING</b> (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>Councillor Nelson-Welson declared a non-pecuniary interest in items 7 and 8 as the application site was situated within his Ward. He left the room during the consideration of these items.</p> <p>Councillor Garelick declared a non-pecuniary interest in items 9 and 10 as the application site was situated within her Ward. She remained in the room during the consideration of these items.</p>
47.	<p><b>TO RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING</b> (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b> That the minutes of the meeting dated 17 January 2024 be agreed as an accurate record.</p>
48.	<p><b>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p>

	None.
49.	<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 in Part I and would be considered in public.</p>
50.	<p><b>19 BEACON CLOSE, UXBRIDGE - 17969/APP/2023/1014</b> (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p><b>Erection of four terraced dwellings incorporating landscaping, parking provision, waste and cycle stores following demolition of existing dwelling.</b></p> <p>Officers presented the application and highlighted the information in the addendum. It was noted that planning permission for a similar scheme had been refused by the Borough Planning Committee in January 2023 citing eight reasons for refusal. Refusal reasons relating to ecology, accessibility, cycle parking and a tree had been overcome in the current application. However, Members heard that refusal reasons relating to overdevelopment of the site, harm to the character and appearance of the area and the completion of a S106 legal agreement to secure highways works and prohibit the issuing of parking permits to prospective residents had not been resolved. The application was therefore recommended for refusal.</p> <p>A petition had been received by Democratic Services in objection to the scheme. The lead petitioner's written representation was read out for the consideration of the Committee Members. Key points highlighted included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A previous application for a similar proposed development at the site had been refused for eight compelling reasons;</li> <li>• Despite a number of minor cosmetic changes, no change of substance were proposed in the current application before the Committee;</li> <li>• The current application sought to replace a detached single storey bungalow with four terraced houses, each comprising two storeys and containing three bedrooms hence being capable of accommodating five occupants;</li> <li>• Petitioners welcomed the four valid reasons for refusal proposed by officers in the report;</li> <li>• The design of the proposed new buildings was completely inconsistent with the street scene;</li> <li>• The proposal represented a gross over-development of the site;</li> <li>• The proposal sought to create an excessively large hard standing area to the front of the boundary to create parking and bin storage areas. This was inconsistent with the character of neighbouring properties and the street scene;</li> <li>• Three additional reasons for refusal were proposed in relation to: 1) the increase in traffic which would result if the proposal were to go ahead (particularly given the low PTAL rating of the site and the absence of viable public transport facilities); 2) increased demand for parking and 3) disruption and traffic congestion resulting from the demolition and construction phases of the project;</li> <li>• Beacon Close was a quite residential street. Residents had invested in their homes and had the right to expect their way of life not to be disrupted by a scheme designed solely for financial gain.</li> </ul> <p>The applicant was in attendance and addressed the Committee Members. Key points</p>

highlighted included:

- In the current application a number of the concerns previously raised had been addressed namely ecology, internal layout and tree matters;
- The proposals did not conflict with development plan policies;
- The first proposed reason for refusal in the report related to failure to harmonise with the street scene. These comments were misleading and did not reflect the current pattern of development. On entering Beacon Close from Harefield Road there were four terraced dwellings and some semi-detached properties. To the south, Beacon Close was characterised by detached dwellings with gable roofs and traditional materials. Terraced and detached properties were therefore a common theme along the road and the proposed design would mirror the existing dwellings with gable roofs and soft planting. The erection of a similar end of terraced dwelling in another part of the Close had been approved by Planning officers. The applicant's proposed dwellings would fit well with the wider street scene;
- The second reason for refusal referenced the building line. The property had only one immediate neighbour. An amended plan submitted had demonstrated that the dwellings would be in line with this property not further forward and set back further than other semi-detached dwellings in the vicinity. The development would be 1m deeper than no.24 therefore building line not broken;
- The third reason for refusal referred to the absence of a legal agreement. A legal agreement had been prepared and submitted securing highways contributions to which the applicant would make financial contributions. Highways comments were largely favourable;
- The site was misunderstood and was 25m wide. Harvil Road was similar to Beacon Close and had previously had only detached dwellings. A development of seven flats and semi-detached houses had been built in recent years - the character of a road could evolve over time.

In response to questions from Members, the applicant stated that there were currently only two bungalows in the street and the proposed development would sit nicely next to the neighbouring bungalow and abutting the semi-detached properties.

In response to questions from the Committee regarding the S106 legal agreement, it was explained that, as detailed on page 33 of the agenda pack, had officers been minded to recommend that the application be approved, a legal agreement to secure the necessary obligations would have been secured.

Members sought further clarification as to the viability of the additional reasons for refusal as proposed by the petitioner. In respect of traffic implications, it was confirmed that these were not considered significant enough to warrant an additional reason for refusal. The Parking Management Scheme matter was covered by condition number 4 and construction impacts would be temporary.

Members commented that the proposal constituted overdevelopment of the site and would be harmful to the character of the area and the street scene. The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

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

51. **HAYES PARK CENTRAL AND SOUTH (FUL) - 12853/APP/2023/1492** (*Agenda Item 7*)

**Formal Description: Change of use of the existing buildings to provide new homes (Use Class C3), together with internal and external works to the buildings, landscaping, car and cycle parking, and other associated works.**

**Detailed Description: Proposed change of use of the Grade II\* Listed Hayes Park Central and Hayes Park South office buildings (Use Class E) to 124 residential flats (Use Class C3), with access to 124 car parking spaces and 207 cycle stands. Internal and external works to the buildings are proposed, alongside landscaping works to create a communal square, play space and amenity space.**

Having declared an interest in the application, Councillor Nelson-West left the room and did not participate in the discussion or voting on this matter.

Officers presented the application and highlighted the additional information in the addendum. Items 7 and 8 were presented together. It was noted that the proposal would change the use of two Grade II listed buildings; however, it was considered that the benefits would outweigh the harm. It had been concluded that the scheme would generate a deficit, but this was within the range of deliverability when accounting for growth within the market. The development was proposed with 10% shared ownership affordable housing and was recommended for approval.

In response to questions from the Committee, it was confirmed that the land surrounding the application site was privately owned / Green Belt land. It did not form part of the application therefore could not be restricted. However, the land was protected by planning policy hence any future proposed developments on the land would need to come to Committee for consideration.

Members enquired whether additional family units could be incorporated into the scheme. It was confirmed that the proposal would generate a deficit hence a request for additional family housing would not be considered viable. On balance the inclusion of 10% affordable housing was considered acceptable.

Members welcomed the proposed scheme noting that the building had lain empty for some four or five years and the proposal would help to address the need for additional housing in the Borough. The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously agreed by the voting Members subject to the S106 and amendments in the addendum (Cllr Nelson-West did not participate in the vote on this matter).

**RESOLVED: That the application be approved subject to S106 and subject to amendments to conditions 4, 13 and 14 as stated in the addendum report.**

52. **HAYES PARK CENTRAL AND SOUTH (LBC) - 12853/APP/2023/1493** (*Agenda Item 8*)

**Internal and external works to the buildings associated with a change of use (Application for Listed Building Consent).**

Having declared an interest in the application, Cllr Nelson-West left the room and did not participate in the discussion or voting on this matter.

Officers presented the application and highlighted the additional information in the addendum. Items 7 and 8 were presented together.

The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously agreed by the voting Members subject to the S106 and amendments in the addendum (Cllr Nelson-West did not participate in the vote on this matter).

**RESOLVED: That the application be approved subject to amendments to conditions 4 and 5 as stated in the addendum report.**

53. **ROSEDALE COLLEGE, WOOD END GREEN ROAD, HAYES -  
16034/APP/2023/2812** (*Agenda Item 9*)

**Redevelopment of the Rosedale College site to provide improved teaching and sports facilities. Proposed works to include demolition and renovation of existing buildings, the erection of 2 new buildings, a plant room, social and dining canopies, multi-use games areas, sports fields and football pitches, new parking area and provision of associated infrastructure. Pupil number to remain unchanged.**

Councillor Garelick had declared a non-pecuniary interest in items 9 and 10 as the application site was situated within her Ward. She remained in the room during the consideration of these items.

Officers presented the application and highlighted the information in the addendum. The application related to the redevelopment of Rosedale College to provide improved teaching and sports facilities. No changes to pupil numbers were proposed. The development proposal would involve the demolition of two existing blocks, one of which was a temporary block which should have been removed by the end of June 2014 and returned to its original use as a playing field / sports pitch. The two blocks were to be replaced by new contemporary teaching blocks.

The benefits of the scheme were considered to outweigh the potential harm derived by the minor loss in teaching space and playing field. It was considered that the development would cause no harm to the character and appearance of the area. In terms of noise, the energy centre would not impact negatively on neighbours and the new development would be of a similar scale to the existing. More trees would be incorporated into the new scheme and the existing car parking area would be extended. The application was recommended for approval.

Councillors commented that condition 12 seemed restrictive in terms of staffing numbers. It was confirmed that the condition was proposed to ensure staff and student numbers were controlled as any increase would impact on parking and traffic.

In response to further questions from the Committee, it was confirmed that the new heating system would be more efficient and would service the new buildings and those to be refurbished as a minimum.

Members were reassured that the proposal would include a considerable number of additional trees some of which would be capable of absorbing carbon and pollutants.

The Committee sought reassurance that the proposed car parking arrangements would be adequate. It was noted that there was a move towards sustainable options and a financial contribution was proposed to secure improved cyclist and pedestrian access to the site. A travel plan had also been secured. Public transport options were also

	<p>available though it was recognised that these were somewhat limited.</p> <p>At the request of Members, an amendment to condition 11 (landscaping) to include specific reference to a maintenance plan for the green roof was agreed. The requirement for a strict Construction Management Plan was noted given the narrow entrances to the site.</p> <p>Members welcomed the proposal noting that it would provide a much better environment for students which would be more conducive to learning and would serve them well.</p> <p>The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously agreed subject to S106, the amendments in the addendum and amendment to condition 11 (landscaping) to include specific reference to a maintenance plan for the green roof.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED: That the application be approved subject to S106, amendments to conditions 4 and 12 as stated in the addendum report and amendment to condition 11 (landscaping) to include specific reference to a maintenance plan for the green roof.</b></p>
54.	<p><b>ROSEDALE COLLEGE (TEMPORARY CLASSROOMS ASSOCIATED WITH 2812) - 16034/APP/2023/2796</b> (<i>Agenda Item 10</i>)</p> <p><b>Erection of temporary teaching units for a period of 18-24 months, to provide teaching accommodation whilst the wider re-development works are undertaken on the wider site. Including temporary infrastructure works.</b></p> <p>Councillor Garelick had declared a non-pecuniary interest in items 9 and 10 as the application site was situated within her Ward. She remained in the room during the consideration of these items.</p> <p>Officers presented the application and highlighted the information in the addendum. The application sought permission for a temporary teaching unit for a period of 18-24 months. The unit would be utilised as a teaching facility while the development of the site was underway. The application was recommended for approval.</p> <p>In response to questions from Members, it was confirmed that the temporary building would be demolished at the end of the agreed period and the land restored to its original use as a sports pitch. Members heard that no additional hard surfacing around the existing trees was proposed and all trees would be protected during the construction phase.</p> <p>Members raised no further concerns. 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 amendments to condition 8 as stated in the addendum report.</b></p>
55.	<p><b>CIVIC CENTRE, UXBRIDGE (LISTED BUILDING CONSENT) - 14805/APP/2023/3274</b> (<i>Agenda Item 11</i>)</p> <p><b>Alterations to the existing covered walkway between the Corporate entrance and</b></p>

	<p><b>the Middlesex Suite (2nd level of the building) to form a fully enclosed link by installing new windows and glazed screens. Formation of new entrance door (1st level of the building) to North Quadrant.</b></p> <p>Agenda items 11 and 12 were considered together. Officers presented the applications which sought planning permission / listed building consent for alterations to the existing walkway between the Corporate entrance and the Middlesex Suite at the Civic Centre. It was noted that the Civic Centre was a Grade II listed building. Members heard that the proposed works would facilitate improvements to current access arrangements to public services which were not easily accessible at present. It was confirmed that Heritage and Access officers had raised no concerns in respect of the proposals.</p> <p>Members welcomed the proposal commenting that it struck the right balance between the protection of an asset and improved access for residents.</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.</b></p>
56.	<p><b>CIVIC CENTRE, UXBRIDGE - 14805/APP/2023/3254</b> (<i>Agenda Item 12</i>)</p> <p><b>Alterations to the existing covered walkway (2nd level of the building) between the Corporate entrance and the Middlesex Suite to form a fully enclosed link by installing new windows and glazed screens. Formation of new entrance door (1st level of the building) to 1 North Quadrant.</b></p> <p>Officers presented items 11 and 12 together. Members welcomed the proposal commenting that it struck the right balance between the protection of an asset and improved access for residents.</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.</b></p>
57.	<p><b>RUISLIP COURT RALEIGH CLOSE, RUISLIP - 77839/APP/2023/3167</b> (<i>Agenda Item 13</i>)</p> <p><b>Installation of 3 no. household refuse areas including timber fence enclosures with gates and changes to path and dropped kerb, following removal of brick walled refuse areas. Installation of new wheelie bins and dropped kerb (14 DAY RECONSULTATION - due to revised siting proposed pathway for Site B)</b></p> <p>Officers presented the application which was recommended for approval.</p> <p>Members welcomed the proposal noting that the current bin stores were dilapidated and in need of repair.</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.</b></p>

	The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 8.15 pm.

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