

# Minutes

## HILLINGDON PLANNING COMMITTEE

15 January 2025

Meeting held at Committee Room 5 - Civic Centre



HILLINGDON  
LONDON

	<p><b>Committee Members Present:</b> Councillors Henry Higgins (Chair) Keith Burrows Elizabeth Garelick Gursharan Mand Jagjit Singh Philip Corthorne Darran Davies</p> <p><b>LBH Officers Present:</b> Michael Briginshaw, Deputy Team Leader Chris Brady, Planning Team Leader Eoin Concannon, Planning Team Leader Katie Crosbie, Area Planning Service Manager - North Natalie Fairclough, Legal Advisor Roz Johnson, Head of Development Management and Building Control Michael Kemp, Deputy Team Leader Liz Penny, Democratic Services Officer Dr Alan Tilly, Transport, Planning and Development Team Manager</p>
1.	<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies were received from Councillor Roy Chamdal with Councillor Philip Corthorne substituting and from Councillor Adam Bennett with Councillor Darran Davies substituting.</p>
2.	<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>
3.	<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 5 December 2024 be agreed as an accurate record.</p>
4.	<p><b>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
5.	<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>
<p>6.</p>	<p><b>22 BELMONT CLOSE, UXBRIDGE - 79130/APP/2024/1864</b> (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p><b>Erection of a detached house with 4 bedrooms and associated parking, amenity and bin/cycle stores (updated plans)</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the application, highlighted the information in the addendum and made a recommendation for approval.</p> <p>The lead petitioner was in attendance and addressed the Committee on behalf of the petitioners. Key points highlighted included:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The property developer had initially stated that the rear walls of the main house and the ground floor extension would not exceed the rear walls of the lead petitioner's house or extension to minimise overlooking, but this promise had not been kept.</li> <li>2. The developer had claimed that the petitioner's building was incorrectly positioned relative to the ordinance survey map but had provided no evidence of this.</li> <li>3. It was believed that the developer was only interested in adding significant space to each room to increase the property's value.</li> <li>4. The petitioner had been confident Hillingdon Council would hold the developer accountable, but it appeared the Council may approve the build retrospectively.</li> <li>5. The breach had been brought to the attention of the Planning Department, but no action had been taken. The petitioner had therefore been obliged to hire a solicitor.</li> <li>6. Objections focussed on the position of all rear walls and the floor height of the building, impacting the lead petitioner's privacy.</li> <li>7. Residents request the Planning Committee defer their decision and visit the site to see the impact for themselves.</li> <li>8. The raised floor heights compromised the privacy of neighbouring gardens, and residents preferred that the floor levels be reduced rather than having a higher fence.</li> <li>9. The ground floor bathroom was overlooked by a side door and window not in the original plans, exacerbated by the raised floor heights.</li> <li>10. A covenant was requested to ensure the patio was lower than the house as per the plans and to ensure that the side window was obscured and non-opening.</li> <li>11. The petitioner suggested that the building be demolished and rebuilt with lower floor levels and rear walls level with their rear walls.</li> </ol> <p>In response to questions from Members, it was clarified that the original plans had not been accurate. All floors in the new building were higher than on the plans which impacted the privacy of neighbours.</p> <p>The agent for the application was in attendance and addressed the Committee. Key points highlighted included:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The agent confirmed that he had originally designed the house.</li> <li>2. He addressed concerns about overshadowing, stating that the back of the garden was south-facing and would therefore not be affected by shadowing.</li> <li>3. The ground floor side-facing window was higher than the neighbouring window,</li> </ol>

but the floor level was lower due to a larger window.

4. It had been agreed with the planning department that the fence would be 2.2 meters high to prevent looking in.
5. It was suggested that silhouettes through the window could be avoided by using a blind.
6. The agent affirmed that the building was not larger than originally planned and that the back wall was slightly further back than the neighbouring house.
1. The original site plan had been based on the Ordinance Survey as required by the Council.
2. The agent had tried without success to discuss the discrepancy with the neighbour.
3. The scaffold had been used to measure the distance between the houses, resulting in two different colours on the plan to show the Ordinance Survey vs reality.
4. The building size had been checked by the enforcement officer and matched the original planning permissions.
5. The agent offered to reduce the floor level by 50mm by using a thinner screed.
6. He explained that moving the building forward would result in seeing more of the garden.
7. The attic dormer room was obscured by the roof, preventing any overlooking.

Ward Councillor Tony Burles was in attendance and addressed the Committee in support of petitioners claiming that the development had flouted the planning permission and was out of proportion. He recommended that the building be demolished. Councillor Burles confirmed that he had visited the site and advised the Committee Members to do the same before reaching a decision on the matter.

Officers were invited to respond to the points raised.

They empathised with residents and the petitioner, acknowledging the difficulty in understanding the plans due to multiple iterations across different applications.

The concern about the building extending beyond the rear elevation of the neighbouring property was addressed. It was noted that the replotting of the neighbouring property had resulted in a minor protrusion of 0.7 meters at ground floor level. The committee report reflected this 0.7-meter protrusion, and officers had considered whether this extension was harmful. It had been concluded that a 0.7-meter extension was acceptable compared to the local plan allowance of 3.6 meters for a single-story rear extension.

Ground levels were discussed, with officers noting a land level change and a difference of approximately 40 cm between the rear garden and the area around the building.

The increase in finished floor levels was deemed not significant enough to depart from policy or cause harm to neighbouring properties in terms of flooding.

It was noted that the side elevation window had moved since the original planning application due to the inclusion of an air source heat pump. The window served a bathroom and was mostly obscurely glazed, with no policy position to protect non-habitable rooms from overlooking or overshadowing. Members heard that a 2.2m high fence had been installed to mitigate potential overlooking into the window.

The request for a member site visit was addressed, with officers not seeing a departure

from the original consent. It was noted that the application needed to be determined within a specific timeframe to avoid the risk of a non-determination appeal.

Officers confirmed that the dwelling itself had been built in accordance with the plans, but the neighbouring property had not been plotted correctly, leading to a breach of planning control.

The enforcement approach involved negotiation and the submission of a retrospective application to assess the acceptability of the proposal as built<sup>2</sup>.

It was noted that the previous consent had been considered a fallback position, and the focus was on the differences between the previously accepted design and the current proposal.

Members requested further clarification regarding the ground levels at the site. It was confirmed that there was a natural ground level change between the application site and the neighbouring property and that a difference in height of a new development of up to 30 cm was not unusual. No concerns regarding flooding impact had been raised. Members were informed that there was no policy justification for refusal and refusal would be difficult to justify at appeal.

In response to further questions from the Committee, it was confirmed that a compliance condition would secure all flooding matters. A further condition would ensure the side window and door would be obscure glazed. Officers did not feel a reduction in screed height was required but were happy to add this as a condition if deemed necessary by Members.

The legal advisor noted that a site visit would not be advisable unless it was essential to enable Members to reach a decision due to lack of information currently available to them.

Members raised no further queries or concerns. The officer's recommendation, subject to the addendum, amendments to Conditions 3 and 8 as outlined by officers and the addition of a Condition in relation to the reduced finished floor levels was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

**RESOLVED: That the application be approved subject to amendments to Conditions 3 and 8 as outlined in the verbal update and the insertion of an additional Condition to address the reduced finished floor levels as put forward by the agent in the meeting.**

7. **72 HAREFIELD ROAD, UXBRIDGE - 25767/APP/2024/2484** (*Agenda Item 7*)

**Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of building to provide 3 x 1-bed, 5 x 2-bed, 1 x 3 bed flats with associated parking and amenity space.**

Officers introduced the application and made a recommendation for approval. There was no addendum, but officers suggested an amendment to conditions to require that all windows shown as obscured on the elevation plan be fitted with obscure glazes. It was also proposed that the reference to EV points be removed from Condition 5 as this was already covered sufficiently under Condition 9.

A petition had been received in objection to the application and a written representation

had been submitted which was read out for the attention of the Committee. Key points highlighted included:

- Previous similar applications by the same applicant had been rejected multiple times.
- The current application prioritised one- and two-bedroom dwellings, not aligning with the Council's ethos of providing family-sized accommodation.
- The property's roof size was too large compared to the surrounding area and not in keeping with the area's character and appearance.
- Significant negative effects on neighbouring properties were noted, including reduced space, increased noise, and air pollution.
- Additional traffic from a hypothetical increase from two to nine households would impact noise, air pollution, and traffic safety on Harefield Road.
- The application increased the risk to existing residents and pedestrians from Braybourne Close crossing Harefield Road to go to Hermitage School.
- No consideration had been given to the dangerous junction from Fairfield Road to Harefield Road where cars would be unsighted to vehicles leaving the property.
- The amount of green space would be reduced due to converting garden space to a car park and would not meet the minimum green space per person.
- There would be a net reduction in trees, with reliance on trees from adjoining properties for cover.
- There would be an inadequate number of car parking spaces (12 instead of the recommended 14).
- Potential privacy issues from balconies overlooking surrounding properties were noted.
- The lead petitioner urged the Council to consider the repeated rejections and appeals by the applicant and not to waste valuable time and resources on this application.

The applicant was in attendance at the meeting and addressed the Committee. Key points highlighted included:

- The current application being presented was very different from the first iteration.
- The scale of the building had been substantially reduced, with the height now much lower than its neighbour to the left and equal to the neighbour on the right.
- The width had also been reduced to match the width of the buildings to the left.
- The gaps left between the buildings were a minimum of 5 metres.
- The building to the right was much wider and screened by a 65-meter row of protected trees.
- The rear projection had been reduced in depth significantly.
- The previous application had been approved by the inspector, and the building being considered was the same size as the approved scheme.
- The application proposed a car parking area to the rear, replicating the parking arrangements of the two neighbouring blocks of flats.
- The parking area abutted the petitioner's property at the very end of their long garden.
- Twelve car spaces were provided for the nine flats, supported by the Highways Officer.
- The 2021 census showed that less than 50% of flat owners had access to a car or a van hence the amount of car spaces proposed was deemed suitable.
- An undertaking with the Council restricted future occupants from applying for

parking permits on surrounding streets.

- The two previous planning applications for nine flats on the site were comparable in terms of highways impact.
- The appeals inspector had concluded that refusal on highways amenity grounds would not be justified.
- The Council's Highways Officer had never raised any objection on highway safety grounds.
- The development would only add two to three extra vehicle movements during peak hours.
- The previous applications had been refused due to the scale of the building being considered overdevelopment and its impact on the street scene..
- The criticisms had been taken on board and acted on constructively, gaining support from the inspector.
- Creating seven much-needed extra dwellings was believed to benefit the area.
- The improved scheme had the full support of the planning department.
- An alternative site layout plan and revised BNG report had been submitted to the planning department.

In response to questions from Members, the applicant confirmed that, although it was a requirement to include a replacement family dwelling, one and two-bedroom apartments were much more desirable than a three-bedroom flat hence only one of the latter had been included in the scheme.

Members sought further clarification in respect of the rear area and enquired whether a barrier would be installed to protect the community amenity green space. The applicant confirmed that a full landscaping plan would be submitted, and bollards could be installed if required.

Ward Councillor Tony Burles was in attendance and addressed the Committee Members in support of petitioners. Councillor Burles expressed concern that the applicant was not building in accordance with the planning permission granted to him. He also highlighted the fact that Harefield Road was a very fast road and additional cars in the area would exacerbate the problem. Councillor Burles noted that there was a need for family accommodation in Hillingdon rather than additional flats.

In response to further questions from the Committee, it was confirmed that the PTAL rating of the site was 1 which was considered poor. The Highways Officer in attendance confirmed that it was felt the number of parking spaces would not cause risk to the traffic within the area as Harefield Rd had a 30 mile an hour speed limit, street lighting and footways. Moreover, sight lines for vehicles pulling out onto the highway were protected. It was noted that the number of cars leaving the site was deemed to be insignificant and could be absorbed by the existing traffic flows.

In reply to their requests for further clarification, Members heard that planning officers deemed the proposed development to be an efficient use of the site. In respect of tree retention, it was confirmed that all the trees which were of visual amenity value and contributed to the character of the area would be retained on the site.

Councillors enquired whether the previous refusal on appeal had been purely based on size and scale. It was confirmed that this was the case.

Members requested the inclusion of a condition to protect the amenity space to the rear of the site as previously discussed. They raised no further questions. The officer's

recommendation was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously approved.

**RESOLVED: That the application be approved subject to amendments to Conditions 5 and 6 as outlined in the verbal update, the amendment of Condition 5 (landscaping) to include details of a method to demarcate the communal amenity space from the shared accessway and completion of s106 agreement.**

8. **HARROW AND WEMBLEY SOCIETY MODEL ENGINEERS, ROXBOURNE PARK, EASTCOTE - 22899/APP/2023/2219** (*Agenda Item 8*)

**Part-retrospective provision of one portacabin with paint-finished timber cladding to provide a ticket office and community space.**

Officers introduced the application, highlighted the information in the addendum and made a recommendation for approval.

The lead petitioner was not in attendance but the agent for the application had submitted a presentation and addressed the Committee Members. Key points highlighted included:

- Members of the Harrow and Wembley Society Model Engineers had been members for about five years.
- The railway consisted of about half a mile of track and had provided steam and electric rides for local people since 1978.
- The area was rented from Harrow Council and operated by volunteers from the Harrow and Wembley Society Model Engineers, a not-for-profit organisation.
- The railway operated every Sunday afternoon during the summer and held special events over Easter, Halloween, and Christmas.
- In 2024, the railway had carried around 4,000 passengers and attracted about 1,000 visitors on public holidays.
- The site provided a destination for families, offering tables and benches for picnics.
- The society ran various clubs for local people, including a club for teenagers to learn technical skills.
- They facilitated parties for scouts, Cubs, children with special needs and school visits, and hosted birthday parties.
- The society had about 75 members and had been featured in two BBC documentaries and a local podcast.
- The clubhouse contained 11 carriages, 10 locomotives, workshop machinery, and a signal box.
- Due to increasing demand and the aging members, they needed additional space and proposed using a portacabin.

In response to their requests for clarification, Members were informed that there had previously been a Clubhouse on site. Harrow and Wembley Society Model Engineers had needed additional space and had been given permission by Harrow to install two portacabins on site. However, it had transpired that they needed planning permission for these hence the decision to remove one.

In respect of antisocial behaviour, the Committee was informed that the portacabins had been on site for 16 months and, during that time, there had only been one tag on the back of the building. There was a presence on site at least two days a week and,

though not lit, the site was completely fenced for added security. Officers confirmed that a consultation with the Metropolitan Police had not been deemed necessary.

Councillors raised no further concerns or objections. The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

**RESOLVED: That the application be approved subject to the amendments to Conditions 3, 4 and 5 as detailed in the Addendum Report and no materially significant representations received at the end of the public re-consultation (ends 17-01-25) as detailed in the Committee Report.**

9. **140 FAIRHOLME CRESCENT, HAYES - 57533/APP/2023/3146** (*Agenda Item 9*)

**Creation of an extra unit in 6 unit HMO (Class C4).**

Officers introduced the application and made a recommendation for approval.

The lead petitioner had submitted a written representation and photos on behalf of petitioners objecting to the proposal. The statement was read out to the Committee Members. Key points highlighted included:

1. Several issues had come to light over the past year, significantly impacting the quality of life for nearby residents.
2. Despite being approved as a 6-bedroom HMO for students, there were often more than six residents living at the property, sometimes including couples and children.
3. Frequent disturbances during evening hours disrupted the peace and quiet expected in a residential area.
4. Large amounts of rubbish were frequently left on the driveway, leading to unpleasant smells and attracting vermin.
5. Multiple reports of marijuana being smoked at the property forced neighbours to close their windows due to the smell.
6. Parking was a significant issue, with several cars frequently parked at the property.
7. Rear access was constantly used, compromising the security of neighbouring properties and posing a significant safety risk.
8. The garden was often littered with rubbish and discarded mattresses, creating an ideal habitat for vermin.
9. Residents frequently cooked on the decking outside, which was unsanitary and posed a considerable fire risk.
10. The petitioner urged the Council to reject the application, stating that any further expansion would be detrimental to both the immediate neighbours and the wider community.

The applicant and agent were not in attendance and no written submissions had been received.

Members enquired what action had been taken by the Council's licencing team regarding the complaints raised by residents. Officers explained that the planning process for HMOs differed from the licensing process. However, officers had conducted a search but had been unable to locate any reports of antisocial behaviour.



Members were informed that the certificate in place was a Certificate of Lawful Development hence there were limits to the planning controls that could be deployed. However, the development brought forward a site plan that included a location for rubbish bins. Officers had enforcement powers to undertake enforcement action should the bins not be placed in that location. Details of waste and cycle storage and EV charging points had been requested and officers had everything in their power in terms of proposing conditions on the development.

In response to questions from the Committee regarding fire safety, it was confirmed that the fire brigade regularly inspected the site. Members expressed concern regarding potential misuse of the units but were advised that a management plan would not be justified in this case.

Councillors referred to the Case Officer's visit to the site in February 2023 and enquired whether notice would have been given. Officers confirmed that they were not required to give notice but generally did to ensure they were able to gain access. The Planning Officer had undertaken more than two visits but had not checked numbers of occupants. However, a condition was included to restrict the number of people residing in the property – visitor numbers would not be restricted.

The Committee sought further details of parking arrangements at the site. It was confirmed that two parking spaces were available which was deemed sufficient. The Highways Officer advised Members that the London Plan was silent on parking standard for HMOs. The Local Plan indicated 3 spaces would be appropriate, but these were maximum standards. However, the Highways Officer highlighted the need for a condition to regularise the situation whereby cars were mounting the kerb to access the hard standing; this was illegal and caused damage to the footway. An extension to the existing vehicular crossover was recommended.

At the request of Members, it was agreed that officers would advocate for 7 bins to serve the 7 rooms at the development. These details would be duly assessed by the Case Officer and management.

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

**RESOLVED: That the application be approved subject to the insertion of a new condition providing for an extension to the existing vehicular crossover and an amendment to Condition 7 (waste) to ensure the details demonstrated that the refuse storage provision would be of sufficient capacity to serve the approved number of maximum occupants.**

10.	<p><b>100 EXMOUTH ROAD, SOUTH RUISLIP - 42576/APP/2024/2465</b> (<i>Agenda Item 10</i>)</p> <p><b>Retention of a double storey rear and side extension with amendments to fenestration and height of existing single storey rear extension (retrospective)</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the application and made a recommendation for approval.</p> <p>Petitioners were in attendance and addressed the Committee in objection to the proposal. Key points highlighted included:</p>
-----	--

1. The case was complex, involving many unfortunate factors and a wrongly drawn plan by the applicant's architect.
2. The Council was accused of making an oversight and not applying local planning recommendations to set back the side wall of the rear double storey extension by 1m.
3. Their orientation to the extension was unique and critically positioned, but the Council had not applied the local recommendation.
4. The affected neighbours felt that the Council had not paid enough attention to the critical details of the planning application.
5. Residents had trusted the Council but believed they had been unfairly treated in this case.
6. The petitioners requested the Councillors reach a "no decision" on this application at this stage.
7. The planning officers' detailed report indicated that Councillors would be minded to approve the second application.
8. Residents hoped that, rather than referring to DRE guidelines and sunlight/daylight calculations, Councillors would consider the simpler build guidelines and the Council's one-metre side boundary distance policy.
9. It was pointed out that previous appeals in the road in 2019 and 2020 had met the Council's requirements to be set 1m away from shared side boundaries at first floor level and created minimal overshadowing to neighbours.
10. The neighbours argued that other referenced two-storey side extensions were not relevant to the current application.
11. It was believed that a no decision would support the nearest neighbour and retain the approval granted earlier in 2024.
12. Petitioners highlighted the need to bring important circumstances in front of the elected Planning Committee. They felt it was virtually impossible for planning permission previously granted, whether by clerical miscalculation or planning policy oversight, to be revoked.
13. It was hoped that an identical planning decision would not be made within the suburbs of the Borough of Hillingdon until changes to current planning guidance were merited.

In response to questions from Members, petitioners confirmed that a 'no decision' was requested at this time.

The applicant and agent for the application were in attendance and addressed the Committee Members. Key points highlighted included:

- The agent emphasised the pressure his clients had been under for the past six months.
- He reported that neighbours had been aware of the proposed plans throughout the planning application stage, but complaints had only started when the first floor of the rear extension was being constructed.
- The development was constructed in compliance with the approved drawings, despite a slight inaccuracy in the relationship with the neighbouring properties.
- The agent accepted responsibility for the inaccuracy but had expected the Planning Officer to pick up any relevant discrepancy during the site visit.
- He questioned the validity of the petition, noting that over 20 signatures had come from just four households.
- It was argued that the development did not affect the street scene and that his clients were prejudiced by the slightly inaccurate relationship.
- The drawings had been corrected, a daylight and sunlight assessment

completed, and everything now complied with the guidelines and requirements of the planning department.

- It was felt that a decision could and should be made at the meeting.
- The applicant had invited neighbours to view the plans, but one neighbour had not attended the meeting.
- He had faced objections after the second floor was being constructed, despite having shown the plans to neighbours.
- It had been necessary to rush the construction for financial reasons and the applicants had invested all their life savings into the house.
- The client was not in a position to amend the house and felt they were being unfairly dragged through the process.
- The client hoped for a favourable decision to put the matter to rest.

A written statement from Ward Councillors Richard Mills and Heena Makwana had been received and was read out to the Committee. The Ward Councillors noted that both the petitioner and the applicant had engaged with them on the matter and had been advised to work closely with officers to ensure all processes were followed correctly. Members of the Committee were respectfully requested to carefully consider all the information presented to them by officers, the petitioner and the applicant to enable them to reach a fair and informed decision.

In response to requests for clarification from Councillors, it was confirmed that it was the applicant's responsibility to submit a factually correct application with accurate plans. It was acknowledged that there had been a slight departure from the 1m rule which tried to ensure space between properties in respect of street character. Members heard that the development had been constructed in compliance with the approved drawings, despite a slightly inaccurate relationship with the neighbouring properties. The daylight and sunlight assessment had passed all the requirements. It was felt that the development retained a level of openness, with a 0.6 metre distance to the front and up to 1.1 metres at the upper floor level. The back reduced to 0.4 metres, slightly clipping the 45° test but overall, it was felt that the development was acceptable.

In response to further questions from Members, It was clarified that building control records were confidential and that applicants could use third-party registered building control approvers, meaning the Council might not have received the reports.

Concerns were raised about planning enforcement. It was revealed that an enforcement investigation had been opened due to concerns about the footprint during the building stage. A site inspection had been carried out, and a warning letter sent. Planning officers had also visited the site to ensure the accuracy of the plans.

It was noted that a discrepancy had been discovered during the building process. An enforcement officer had visited the site. It had been noted that alterations from the approved plans were minimal; a stop notice had not been issued but a warning letter had been sent out.

Members noted that the officers' recommendation had been based on the merits of the scheme, not its retrospective nature.

No further concerns were raised. The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, agreed with 6 votes in support and one abstention.

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

11. **38 VARCOE GARDENS, HAYES - 79116/APP/2024/2794** (*Agenda Item 11*)

**Conversion of integral garage to habitable accommodation with alterations to fenestration.**

Officers introduced the application and made a recommendation for approval.

A petition had been received in objection to the application. The lead petitioner had submitted a written representation and photos on behalf of the Hayes-Arena Residents' Association, representing 261 households. The statement was read out for the attention of the Committee. Key points highlighted included:

1. Parking pressure - the proposed garage conversion would result in the permanent loss of an off-street parking space which would exacerbate parking stress in Varcoe Gardens thereby impacting public safety and the quality of life of residents.
2. Disruption of community character – the development would disrupt the uniform architectural design of Varcoe Gardens, which was a key feature of the estate's character and aesthetic value.
3. Lack of disability justification and past rejections – the Hayes-Arena estate had granted garage conversions only once, for 85 Varcoe Gardens, and solely on the grounds of addressing disability-related needs. The current application lacked any such justification. Similar applications in the estate had been rejected in the past due to increased parking pressure and disruption to community character—concerns that were equally relevant in this case.
4. Risk of overcrowding and potential HMO use – residents were concerned that the site would be converted to an HMO in the future. Allowing this development would increase the risk of overcrowding and antisocial behaviour, negatively impacting the neighbourhood.
5. Precedents and community impact - the Hayes-Arena estate had experienced significant challenges due to the HMO at 12 Divine Way, which had led to increased emergency service visits and community disruptions. Residents feared that approving the current application may set a precedent for further profit-driven developments that undermined the community's cohesion and quality of life.

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

1. It was confirmed that there was no intention of applying for an HMO. Members were assured that there was a clause in the deed preventing further applications for an HMO.
2. The precedent for the area had been set by number 85, which had been approved under similar circumstances.
3. The planning team had assessed and found the proposal acceptable and had not set any new precedents.
4. The current internal parking space had been deemed insufficient for new models of cars, especially for disability-enabled cars.
5. The proposal retained one off-street parking space, and no further parking stress was anticipated.
6. The character and design of the buildings were maintained, with a similar approach to number 85.

7. The applicant reassured that the design would match the existing buildings.
8. Concerns about antisocial behaviour were addressed, and it was clarified that a single-family house would not result in more antisocial behaviour.
9. The applicant had a full written agreement with the freeholders and estate management, ensuring alignment with the approval.
10. The application complied with local planning policies and the London plan.
11. The proposal respected the character of the area and addressed the specific needs of the homeowner.
12. There were no material planning reasons to refuse the application.

Ward Councillor Kamal Kaur had submitted a brief written representation in support of petitioners which was read out for the attention of the Committee.

In response to Members' questions, it was confirmed that the garage was underutilised and likely to decay over time. The proposal involved replacing the garage door with a window, which would match the existing property's development pattern.

Members emphasised the importance of preserving the character and harmony of the terraced homes and suggested setting a condition to prevent the property from turning into an unlicensed HMO.

Members raised no further concerns or observations. The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, agreed with 6 votes in favour and one abstention.

**RESOLVED: That the application be approved subject to the inclusion of a new condition removing permitted development rights to convert the dwelling into an HMO.**

12. **MINET JUNIOR SCHOOL, AVONDALE DRIVE, HAYES - 2297/APP/2024/2171**  
(Agenda Item 12)

**An application submitted under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to vary Condition 2 (Approved Drawings) of planning permission reference 2297/APP/2021/2704, dated 17-09-2021 (Extensions, remodelling and refurbishment of the existing Nursery, Infant and Junior Schools) to make alterations, including changes to hard and soft landscaping, bin storage, and cycle storage (Part Retrospective and Part Proposed)**

Officers introduced the application, highlighted the information in the addendum and made a recommendation for approval.

Members were in support of the proposal and raised no concerns.

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

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

The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at Time Not Specified.

---

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