

Minutes

HILLINGDON PLANNING COMMITTEE

05 December 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, Barry Nelson-West, and Jagjit Singh</p> <p>Officers Present: Ed Laughton – Area Planning Service Manager (Central & South) Eoin Concannon – Planning Team Leader Chris Brady – Planning Team Leader Dr Alan Tilly – Transport & Aviation Team Manager Natalie Fairclough – Legal Advisor Ryan Dell – Democratic Services Officer</p> |
| 53. | <p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies had been received from Councillor Gursharan Mand with Councillor Barry Nelson-West substituting.</p> |
| 54. | <p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>Councillor Barry Nelson-West declared a non-pecuniary interest in item 6 as he had been in contact with the petitioners. He left the room for this item and did not take part in the vote.</p> |
| 55. | <p>TO RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the minutes from the meeting on 05 November 2024 be approved.</p> |
| 56. | <p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>None.</p> |
| 57. | <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.</p> |

58. **16 HAYES END DRIVE, 9105/APP/2024/1760** (*Agenda Item 6*)

Councillor Nelson-West left the room for this item.

Officers introduced the item.

A written representation from the lead petitioner was read out:

There were no objections to a family extending their home as in the case of 31 and 33 Hayes End Drive.

This is not the case with this rented property. This was a landlord trying to increase the income from as many tenants as he can.

This was based on all the applicant's previous applications:

- 27 September 2023 – Erection of a three-bedroom dwelling to rear of existing house – rejected.
- 17 January 2024 – Erection of a three-bedroom dwelling next to existing house – rejected.
- 10 May 2024 – Erection of a two storey, two-bedroom house attached to 16 Hayes End Drive. Applicant was given an option to withdraw application or it would be rejected.
- 15 July 2024 – Erection of a part single two storey side and rear extension. No objection from petitioners.
- 22 August 2024 – Amended planning application with a larger footprint of the two-storey side and rear extension, rear dormers, roof lights, two double back doors and large windows side of extension. Applicant had to reduce the width of the two-storey extension.
- 16 October 2024 – An extra-large widow added to the side extension. Making it three large widows and side door. Already having two double back doors. So potentially becoming a dwelling attached to 16 Hayes End Drive with entrance from Wilma Close.

Petitioners strongly opposed the three large widows on the side elevation. None of the other corner houses had been allowed such large windows, other than a single small opaque window for the landing one per floor, due to the fact the end elevation over looks neighbouring properties and will overlook a rear garden resulting in a lack of privacy. And the door in the side elevation, again no other corner houses have been allowed a side door.

The big concern was that this door will become a front door to a divided property i.e. 16 and 16a.

If the Council approves this application, petitioners requested conditions that the house cannot be divided into two properties and no HMO.

Other considerations were Wilma Close was significantly narrower than other local roads so potentially having an extra dwelling to the side of 16 Hayes End Drive or turning it into an HMO would cause greater problems for parking on an already congested Close.

This area was a medium flood plane and having this extra building footprint could increase the runoff increasing the risk of flooding.

Councillor Darran Davies addressed the Committee as Ward Councillor and made the following points:

- This property risked overdevelopment and harm to the area's character. The extensions were excessive for a prominent corner plot, disrupting the open and uniform nature of the neighbourhood. This directly conflicted with policy DMHB 11 and DMHD 1, which required developments to be in keeping with the area.
- This site had a history of refused applications and overdevelopment. The current proposal, while for the extension, raised similar concerns about scale, scale, layout and intensification.
- The residential amenity was at risk despite revision and the scale of the extension threatened neighbouring properties, particularly 14 Hayes End Drive, with potential overshadowing and reduced privacy. These impacts were significant and conflicted with the principles of protecting residential living.
- Parking and traffic will be worsened. Wilma Close was already under pressure due to the narrow layout and the large property could lead to increased occupancy and parking demands, creating safety and congestion issues, contrary to policy DMT 6.
- It was questioned if a drainage assessment had been carried out. This area was prone to surface water issues and the lack of detailed information on flooding raised concerns that the development could exacerbate flooding risk, contravening policy DMEI 10.
- The removal of mature trees on the site was another concern. These trees contributed to the area's character and biodiversity, yet the proposal did not include sufficient plans to protect or replace them, contrary to policy DMHB 14.
- In summary, this proposal risked overdevelopment and harm to local character and could negatively impact residential amenity.
- The Committee was requested to refuse this application. If approval was considered, it was recommended to impose strict conditions to limit occupancy, safeguard the trees, address the drainage and parking issues and also the overshadowing on other properties.

Officers clarified that policy DMHD 1 and DMHB 11 were not breached as per revised plans. This development, given its policy compliance, would not significantly harm the character and appearance of the area. There were examples of this type of development within the local area.

Condition Six ensured that the property cannot be converted into more than one dwelling without the benefit of further planning permission. Officers had gone above and beyond in order to ensure that any intensification of the site was addressed.

The site was not within a flood risk area, therefore adding a condition regarding surface water drainage would not be justified.

While there was some planting and vegetation on the site, it was not within a TPO area and so trees were not protected and therefore could be removed without consent. There was a landscaping condition that required the details of landscaping to be submitted.

Members noted that the footprint of this application site was one of the smallest

| | |
|-----|--|
| | <p>compared to those in the surrounding area, and there was a similar development opposite the site.</p> <p>Members further asked about the footprint, and officers advised that policy DMHD 1 did not require specific measurements but was based on certain parameters. This application did conform with these parameters.</p> <p>Members asked about parking and officers advised that as this application was for an extension, it was not necessary to assess any additional parking need.</p> <p>Officers' recommendations were moved, seconded and when put to a vote, agreed.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the application be approved</p> |
| 59. | <p>YIEWSLEY COURT, 18928/APP/2024/2272 (<i>Agenda Item 7</i>)</p> <p>Officers introduced the application.</p> <p>Members noted that this application seemed logical, noting the numbers of homeless individuals and being a port authority.</p> <p>Members noted that the report referred to a moderate PTAL rating and asked for the precise rating. Officers noted that the site had a PTAL ranking of three, indicating that access to public transport was reasonable to good compared to London as a whole. Officers also advised that there was a bus stop outside of the site.</p> <p>Members also asked if there was a time frame on 'short-stay'. Officers advised that it would be difficult to quantify this as it would be dependent on the individuals' requirements. It would also be dependent on the availability of accommodation for the individuals to move on to. Conditions on this would not be appropriate as this could lead to individuals being made homeless again. Officers further noted that due to the individuals being homeless, it was likely that they would not have a car and so there was likely an over-provision of parking available.</p> <p>Officers' recommendations were moved, seconded and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the application be approved</p> |
| 60. | <p>47 FAIRFIELD AVENUE, 78928/APP/2024/1952 (<i>Agenda Item 8</i>)</p> <p>Officers introduced the application, which had been brought to Committee following a Member call-in which raised concerns regarding potential loss of amenity to the garage of neighbouring property with a new adjoining bedroom.</p> <p>Members noted that all concerns from residents and the Councillor had been addressed.</p> <p>Officers' recommendations were moved, seconded and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the application be approved</p> |

| | |
|-----|---|
| 61. | <p>45 CAVENDISH AVENUE, 791111/APP/2024/2762 (<i>Agenda Item 9</i>)</p> <p>Officers introduced the application.</p> <p>Officers noted that one representation had been received following publication of the agenda which raised concerns over the property having been unoccupied for some time; previous leakages at the property which have been addressed by Housing officers; and noise, disturbance and antisocial behaviour due to the property not being occupied.</p> <p>Members noted that this was a good project. Members also highlighted that they were happy with the condition about damage to the verge.</p> <p>Officers' recommendations were moved, seconded and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the application be approved</p> |
| 62. | <p>35 BERBERIS WALK, 28236/APP/2024/2761 (<i>Agenda Item 10</i>)</p> <p>Officers introduced the item.</p> <p>Members noted that there was a need for properties for larger families.</p> <p>Officers' recommendations were moved, seconded and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the application be approved</p> |
| | <p>The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 7.50 pm.</p> |

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Ryan Dell on democratic@hillington.gov.uk. Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.