

Minutes

HILLINGDON PLANNING COMMITTEE

2 October 2024



Meeting held at Committee Room 5 - Civic Centre

	<p>Committee Members Present: Councillors Henry Higgins (Chair), Adam Bennett (Vice-Chair), Keith Burrows, Roy Chamdal, Elizabeth Garelick, Gursharan Mand and Jagjit Singh</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: Chris Brady – Planning Team Leader Natalie Fairclough – Legal Advisor Jimmy Walsh – Legal Advisor Anisha Teji – Democratic Services Ed Laughton – Area Planning Service Manager (C&S) Eoin Concannon – Planning Team Leader Richard Michalski – Highways Engineer</p>
32.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>There were no apologies for absence.</p>
33.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>Councillor Gursharan Mand declared a pecuniary interest in agenda item 8: 152-154 Uxbridge Road (4482/APP/2022/213) as the proposed development was opposite his home. He did not vote on the item and left the room during the discussion on the item.</p>
34.	<p>TO RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the minutes from the meeting on 5 September 2024 be approved.</p>
35.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
36.	<p>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 (<i>Agenda Item 5</i>)</p> <p>It was confirmed that all items would be heard in Part I. It was confirmed that all items would be heard in Part I.</p>

37. **19 BEACON CLOSE - 17969/APP/2024/845** (*Agenda Item 6*)

Demolition of existing bungalow and erection of two pairs of semi-detached dwellings to provide 2 x 3-bedroom dwellings and 2 x 2-bedroom dwellings plus associated hard and soft landscaping.

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

A petitioner in objection of the application submitted a written representation for the Committee's consideration. This was circulated to Members prior to the meeting. It was noted that this was the third application for the proposed development, with the first two being refused for multiple reasons. The current application, submitted in April 2024, proposed reducing the development from four three-bedroom houses to two pairs of semi-detached houses. However, it was proposed that the development still constituted overdevelopment, increasing the number of families from one to four, which would lead to increased traffic, parking issues and pressure on the drainage system. It was highlighted that the design of the new buildings was inconsistent with the existing street scene. Additionally, the development would add 8-10 cars, exacerbating traffic and safety concerns. The petitioner requested that if the application was to be approved, strict conditions on working hours during demolition and construction should be enforced to minimise disruption. It was emphasised that Beacon Close was a quiet residential street and the proposed development would significantly disrupt local residents. The Committee was asked to refuse the application or at the very least impose stronger conditions.

A nominated speaker on behalf of the application addressed the Committee and noted that this application had officer support. Members heard that the report was extensive, thorough and comprehensive and took account of both local and national policies. The parking provided on the site was at maximum level and the applicant was willing to enter a legal agreement to restrict further parking. The proposed development was in an area where there were mixed property sizes.

Although Members empathised with the concerns raised by the petitioner, it was noted that the applicant had worked with officers to evolve the scheme doing their best to restrict overdevelopment.

In terms of construction management and the possibility of entering a future parking management scheme in the future, it was explained that properties restricted from parking permits were in a database and any requests would be rejected to avoid breaching the local plan's maximum car parking standards. It was confirmed that a construction logistics plan had been secured by a condition, not just an informative.

During Member discussions it was noted that tandem parking was two parking spaces arranged one behind the other. This setup could cause issues if the spaces were shared by different properties but it was acceptable if both spaces served the same property. It was also noted that the proposed development was within a 10-minute walk of Uxbridge town centre, reducing the need for additional parking.

The officers' recommendation was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, there were six votes in favour and one abstention.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved as per officer recommendation.

38. **39 PARKFIELD ROAD - 24825/APP/2023/81** (*Agenda Item 7*)

Erection of a replacement dwelling.

Officers introduced the application, highlighted the information in the addendum and took Members through the plans. A recommendation for approval was made.

A petitioner in objection of the application addressed the Committee and referred to photographs that were circulated to Members prior to the meeting. Concerns were raised about the planning application, stating that it would be detrimental to other residents due to increased car movements and noise. It was submitted that the neighbourhood was not suitable for commercial property development. The importance of preserving the 1930s bungalows, which were suitable for elderly and frail residents and the need for high daylight factors in housing for elderly was emphasised. The petitioner highlighted issues with the overshadowing of neighbouring properties, reducing visibility and sunlight. It was submitted that the proposed development would cause a cold, gloomy, and damp environment. Concerns were also raised about the lack of privacy due to the height of the proposed development and the impact on neighbouring properties front and back gardens. The Committee was urged to insist on higher standards for developments and to consider the full impact of the proposal. The importance of protecting the neighbourhood and preserving the existing housing stock was emphasised.

The agent for the application addressed the Committee and outlined the proposal. It was submitted that the project had been under consideration for over year and the project aimed to keep the new development in line with the changing street scene. An independent verification of the daylight and sunlight assessment had been conducted. Members were assured that the property was intended to be a family home and that there were no plans for it to be used as a House of Multiple Occupancy (HMO) or hotel. The applicant planned to move into the property when the development was complete.

Councillor Martin Goddard, Ward Councillor for Ickenham and South Harefield addressed the Committee and supported the points raised by the petitioners. Parkfield Road was a road that had 66 houses or bungalows, most homes on this street were bungalows. It was submitted that the emphasis placed on larger houses was disproportionate and the considerable impact of these developments on the residents were highlighted to the Committee. They were inconsistencies in the drawings supporting a particular development. The design and intended use of a property with multiple bedrooms and facilities, suggesting it could be used as an HMO with significant implications for the area was questioned.

The Committee noted that this application had been previously deferred for a site visit. At the site visit Members were surprised by the number of similar-sized developments in the area. Many of these developments were approved on appeal, setting a significant precedent. The petitioners' points were acknowledged however there was a concern that if this went to a planning appeal and was allowed, then there would be no or limited opportunity to impose conditions.

Members enquired whether a condition could be imposed restricting the change of use to a HMO. It was explained that permission would need to be granted for a HMO or hotel. If a large HMO was found to be in operation then this would be investigated under the enforcement route.

	<p>During Member discussions it was noted that the daylight and sun assessment had been independently scrutinised, and the standards had been met in full including the 45 degree test on both the front and rear windows. Officers also provided clarification on the number of bedrooms and the location of the two kitchens.</p> <p>It was agreed that if a future application for change of use to a HMO and hotel were to be made by the applicant, then using the Chair's authority this would be considered at a full Committee meeting.</p> <p>The officers' recommendation, was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, there were six votes in favour and one against.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the application be approved as per officer recommendation.</p>
39.	<p>152-154 UXBRIDGE ROAD - 4482/APP/2022/213 (<i>Agenda Item 8</i>)</p> <p>Erection of three storey mixed use retail and 9 residential apartments with ancillary parking, amendments to dropped kerbs, refuse and bicycle storage, following the demolition of existing buildings.</p> <p>Officers introduced the application, highlighted the information in the addendum and took Members through the plans. A recommendation for approval was made.</p> <p>Neither the petitioner nor applicant addressed the Committee.</p> <p>Concerns were raised about traffic congestion and the availability of parking. Officers provided further information on the highway impact, stating that the development provided nine car parking spaces in a sustainable area with significant local infrastructure. It was confirmed that the development would be air quality positive.</p> <p>The officers' recommendation, was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, there were five votes in favour and one abstention.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the application be approved as per officer recommendation</p>
40.	<p>YEADING INFANT SCHOOL - 17997/APP/2024/1610 (<i>Agenda Item 9</i>)</p> <p>Installation of solar panels on the school roofs.</p> <p>Officers introduced the application and made a recommendation for approval.</p> <p>The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, was unanimously agreed.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the application be approved as per officer recommendation.</p>
41.	<p>PINKWELL PRIMARY - 11242/APP/2024/1302 (<i>Agenda Item 10</i>)</p> <p>Replacement of the existing timber fence with 3.0m high V mesh security fencing.</p> <p>Officers introduced the application and made a recommendation for approval.</p>

	<p>The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, was unanimously agreed.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the application be approved as per officer recommendation.</p>
42.	<p>LBH CENTRAL DEPOT - 4501/APP/2024/1618 (<i>Agenda Item 11</i>)</p> <p>Installation of an acoustic wall around service yard.</p> <p>Officers introduced the application and made a recommendation for approval.</p> <p>The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, was unanimously agreed.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the application be approved as per officer recommendation.</p>
	<p>The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 8.28 pm.</p>

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Anisha Teji, Democratic Services on 01895 277655 or ateji@hillingdon.gov.uk. Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.