

## Minutes

### HILLINGDON PLANNING COMMITTEE

11 April 2024



Meeting held at Committee Room 5 - Civic Centre

	<p><b>Committee Members Present:</b> Councillors Henry Higgins (Chair), Adam Bennett (Vice-Chair), Roy Chamdal, Philip Corthorne, Elizabeth Garelick, Henry Higgins (Chair), Gursharan Mand and Jagjit Singh</p> <p><b>LBH Officers Present:</b> Roz Johnson (Head of Development, Management &amp; Building Control), Katie Crosbie (Area Planning Service Manager – North), Chris Brady (Planning Team Leader), Eoin Concannon (Planning Team Leader), Alan Tilly (Transport &amp; Aviation Team Manager), Jimmy Walsh (Legal Advisor), Natalie Fairclough (Legal Advisor) and Anisha Teji (Democratic Services)</p>
72.	<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Darran Davies with Councillor Phillip Corthorne substituting.</p>
73.	<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>
74.	<p><b>TO 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 14 March 2024 be approved, subject to noting Councillor Adam Bennett's attendance.</p>
75.	<p><b>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
76.	<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>
77.	<p><b>WILLOWTREE MARINA - 46463/APP/2023/2279</b> (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p><b>Conversion of the first floor and loft space to create 3 x 2-bed and 1 x 1- bed flats with ground floor extension for relocation of existing Chandlery</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the application, highlighted the information and provided a verbal update on the conditions in the addendum making amendments to conditions 4 and 8.</p>

Officers took Members through the plans and made a recommendation for approval.

The petitioner was not in attendance at the meeting.

The agent addressed the Committee and highlighted that that applicant had worked with officers to create a well-considered proposal for a modest roof extension to accommodate four flats within an underutilised office space. The new windows would face away from residential properties and would overlook the marina creating a scenic view. The proposal ensured that surrounding residents were not unduly harmed as it took into account any impacts of loss of light, loss of privacy and overlooking. It was submitted that the development would integrate well with current settings, there were no highway objections and the new flats would benefit from close proximity to the Willowtree open space and nearby retail facilities. Local plans and national planning guidelines required that there was effective use of land and encouraged the use of underutilised and under developed sites to maximise potential. The subject site sat outside the boundary of the nearby nature conservation site. The Committee was asked to grant approval for the planning application in line with officers' recommendation.

In response to Member queries regarding the elevations, it was confirmed that there was no raising of the actual ridgeline, two small dormers were proposed and there was an amendment to a form of gabled roof which was noted in the report.

In terms of parking, it was noted that the application site was based within an underutilised car park. Members were advised that parking was compliant with policies and detailed consideration had been given by planning officers in conjunction with highways officers.

The Committee considered that there was no harm to the green belt.

The officers' recommendation, was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

**RESOLVED: That the application be approved as per officer recommendation subject to the additional condition and informative and amendments to conditions 4, 8 and 12 in the addendum and verbal update.**

78. **34, 36, 38 GREEN LANE - 77897/APP/2023/2663** (*Agenda Item 7*)

**Partial demolition of ground floor space to the rear of number 38, and amalgamation of number 36/38 to form a larger and more coherent retail unit on the ground floor. Partial demolition of ground floor space to the rear of number 34 to facilitate the erection of a single storey E-Use workshop building. New external staircase to retained upper floor residential units. Shop front to retail to remain as existing.**

Officers introduced the application and made a recommendation for approval.

A representative on behalf of the Northwood Residents Association (NRA) addressed the Committee and stated that the proposal did not enhance the retail offering in Green Lane and damaged the heritage asset. It was submitted that planning permission should be refused. Historically the pavement was the first section of shops to be completed and it was noted that the proposed site was in the conservation area and

therefore needed to be protected. The proposal was for the retail space to be halved in the primary retail area in Northwood, to be replaced by a workshop which was out of character. Although the workshop would have the same use class it would not be a shop. DMHB1 was highlighted to the Committee and it was stated that the Council would expect development proposals to avoid harm to the historic environment, would only be supported where it sustained and enhanced the significance of the heritage asset and it would not lead to a loss of significance or harm. It was submitted that the harm being proposed outweighed any minimal public benefit and would not make a positive contribution to the local character and distinctiveness of the area. It was submitted that the application was substantially the same as the application previously refused and the concerns regarding fire vehicle access remained. It was noted that 34 Green Lane was one of the few businesses that provided an ADA approved toilet facility and was able to do so due to the depth of the current unit. Concerns were raised regarding the cumulative impact this development would have and there was prospect of more applications on the same parade. The NRA took the view that the proposal was not sympathetic to the local character and the current site deserved to be protected. If consent was granted there was no going back, and the Committee was asked to refuse planning permission.

Further information was provided on the retail in that specific area of Northwood during Members questions to the NRA representative.

Members discussed the cumulative effect of the proposed development and noted that each application was considered on its own merits. Officers explained that the preference was not to lose any retail space, however after reviewing the application with the policy team there were no sustainable refusal reasons on the grounds of cumulative impacts on retail.

The Committee was advised to consider the application before it and that any land ownership matters were separate from planning considerations. Officers were unable to dictate the type of business that would use the property as long as there was compliance with the relevant use class. The Committee was unable to predetermine any future applications and any use class change of the property would need to be determined by the Committee in a future application.

In terms of noise, officers explained that the key matter was that the planning use class was considered acceptable in a residential area. Nevertheless, it was suggested that a condition could be included concerning hours of operation for the proposed workshop.

In response to queries regarding highways, it was explained that the parade of shops was built in 1914, which predated the rise in car ownership and motor transport and as such, the access to the rear was only three metres wide. Fire vehicles required a width of 3.7 metres and the guidance indicated that a fire vehicle must be able to pull up within 45 metres of the property. Measurements had been taken as 47 metres and it had been concluded that a fire vehicle would be able to stop on Green Lane where there were double yellow and zigzag lines. Officers were confident that there would be no issues with fire appliances accessing in the case of an emergency.

Given the proximity to residential properties, Members agreed to include a condition restricting hours of operation of the workshop and amending condition 7 regarding a refuse management plan. With this in mind, the officers' recommendation, was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, there were six votes in favour and one against.

	<p><b>RESOLVED: That the application be approved as per officer recommendation subject to a new condition to regarding hours of operation and amendment to condition 7 on the waste management plan. The condition wording being subject to approval by the Chair.</b></p>
79.	<p><b>90 LONG LANE - 8905/APP/2023/2419</b> (<i>Agenda Item 8</i>)</p> <p><b>Demolition of the existing detached, single dwelling and the erection of a building consisting of 9 no. two-bedroom flats, with associated parking and amenities.</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the application and made a recommendation for refusal.</p> <p>A petitioner in objection to the proposed development addressed the Committee and referred to a photograph as part of their presentation. It was requested that the application be refused due to its overwhelming nature, loss of privacy to neighbouring properties and concerns that a precedent would be set for future applications. The petitioner furthermore stated that 90 Long Lane had residential properties on both sides and there was a concern for how the trees would be impacted in the conservation area. The proposed development was not in keeping with the character of the area and would change the look of the village. The petitioner raised issues with overlooking, noise pollution and how the development would impact the scenery and dynamics of the area. It was emphasised that there should be less building and construction in conservation areas. The proposed development would cause increased traffic congestion, additional cars and footfall in the area. The Committee was asked by the petitioner to refuse the application due to the increased number of residents causing noise pollution, overshadowing, loss of privacy and visual impact on neighbouring properties.</p> <p>During Member clarification questions to the petitioner, it was noted that the photograph demonstrated the car congestion already in the area and the significance of the trees and the bearing they had on the local character of the area.</p> <p>Highways officers confirmed that there were concerns regarding the position of the gate that provided access to the property and the pedestrian and cycle access.</p> <p>The Committee welcomed the officers report and the officers' recommendation, was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED: That the application be refused as per officer recommendation.</b></p>
80.	<p><b>MEADOW HIGH SCHOOL - 3348/APP/2024/74</b> (<i>Agenda Item 9</i>)</p> <p><b>Temporary redevelopment of the site to provide a single storey temporary modular classroom (Use Class F1)</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the application and made a recommendation for approval.</p> <p>During Member discussions it was confirmed that a wooden screening was being proposed in terms of the fencing. It was noted that a Construction Logistics plan had been submitted that considered construction on the main site and the application had been reviewed by the Council's Highways officer as acceptable. Given that this is a temporary permission for a time limited period of 24 months, a new application would</p>

	<p>need to be considered if the proposed modular building was needed for further time.</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>
81.	<p><b>FORMER GARAGES SITE REAR OF SULLIVAN CRESCENT - 60653/APP/2024/295</b> <i>(Agenda Item 10)</i></p> <p><b>Variation of Condition 2 (Approved Plans) of planning permission ref. 60653/APP/2022/531, dated 10-03-23 (Erection of no. 4 x two storey terraced houses and no.2 x two storey semi-detached houses, with associated car parking and landscaping works) to alter footprint and design of Plot 5 to accommodate fully accessible dwelling to meet M4(3) technical specification.</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 8.32 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 [ateji@hillington.gov.uk](mailto:ateji@hillington.gov.uk). Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.