

Minutes

HILLINGDON PLANNING COMMITTEE

12 March 2025

Meeting held at Committee Room 5 - Civic Centre



	<p>Committee Members Present: Councillors Henry Higgins (Chair) Adam Bennett (Vice-Chair) Keith Burrows Roy Chamdal Gursharan Mand Raju Sansarpuri Jagjit Singh</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: Roz Johnson – Head of Development Management and Building Control Ed Laughton – Area Planning Service Manager Eoin Concannon – Planning Team Leader Chris Brady – Planning Team Leader Michael Briginshaw – Deputy Team Leader Dr Alan Tilly – Transport, Planning and Development Team Manager Natalie Fairclough – Legal Advisor Liz Penny – Democratic Services Officer</p> <p>Also Present: Ward Councillor Reeta Chamdal</p>
21.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Elizabeth Garelick with Cllr Raju Sansarpuri substituting.</p>
22.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>Councillor Adam Bennett declared an interest in item 8 as he lived close to the application site. He left the room during consideration of the item and did not take part in the discussion or voting on the matter.</p>
23.	<p>TO RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting dated 13 February be approved as an accurate record.</p>
24.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>

25.	<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 of business were marked Part I and would be considered in public.</p>
26.	<p>13 OAK AVENUE, WEST DRAYTON - 77097/APP/2024/2693 (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p>Erection of a two storey, 2-bed attached dwelling with associated cycle storage and amenity space.</p> <p>Officers introduced the report noting that, at the previous Planning Committee meeting on 13 February 2025, it had been agreed that the application be deferred for a site visit. It was confirmed that the site visit, which had subsequently taken place on 25 February 2025, had provided a useful opportunity for Members to assess the parking situation and the potential impact on the street scene. The application was recommended for approval.</p> <p>The Committee was reminded that a live enforcement investigation was already underway regarding the alleged change of use of the site to an HMO and alleged discrepancies between the building work and the agreed plans. It was noted that this was an entirely separate matter.</p> <p>Members observed that the site visit had been very helpful. It had been apparent that parking was not an issue as many houses had off street parking and there was sufficient on street parking in the area. Moreover, it had been noted that the view of the new dwelling would be almost entirely restricted and would not impact negatively on neighbours or harm the local character of the area.</p> <p>The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the application be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report.</p>
27.	<p>105 HAYES END ROAD, HAYES - 35665/APP/2024/3154 (<i>Agenda Item 7</i>)</p> <p>Conversion of dwelling house into two flats, including the conversion of garage to habitable space, erection of a single storey rear extension, rear dormer with front-facing roof lights, amendments to fenestrations and associated parking (amended description).</p> <p>Officers introduced the application and highlighted the information in the addendum. It was noted that a previous application at the same site had been refused. However, the current application had substantially reduced the size of the proposed development and was therefore recommended for approval.</p> <p>A petition in objection to the application had been received but petitioners and applicants / agents were not in attendance.</p> <p>Members sought further clarification regarding the amenity space and enquired whether it would be possible for the two flats to share the garden area rather than it</p>

being allocated solely for the use of the ground floor flat. It was confirmed that this would be challenging without reducing the size of the ground floor flat to facilitate access. The need to prioritise family-sized accommodation over amenity space was highlighted and it was noted that there was a large park nearby.

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

RESOLVED: That the application be approved subject to the addendum and the conditions set out in the report.

28. **DYSON DRIVE, UXBRIDGE - 78464/APP/2024/3196** (*Agenda Item 8*)

The creation of 9no. off-street parking spaces and planting of 3no. new trees.

Councillor Adam Bennett had declared an interest in this application therefore he left the room and did not take part in the discussion or voting on this item.

Officers presented the application and highlighted the information in the addendum. Members heard that the proposal represented a stark departure from policy and was therefore recommended for refusal. The development would result in an overprovision of car parking and failed to encourage sustainable modes of transport including cycling, walking and the use of public transport.

A petition in support of the application had been received. Petitioners, applicants and the agent were in attendance and addressed the Committee Members. Key points highlighted included:

- The application was a resubmission from a previous application that had been refused due to highway safety grounds.
- The previous plan had sought to mark car parking spaces along the existing private road, which had been deemed unsafe.
- The current residents experienced informal car parking along the road, and the original plan had aimed to regularise it.
- The new proposal rearranged the parking to provide nine off-street parking spaces instead.
- The proposal included two allocated spaces per unit, in line with local parking standards but not in line with regional London Plan standards.
- The application did not initially include a BNG assessment, but it was recognised as a requirement.
- The communal grass had low biodiversity value, and the red line site provided an opportunity to achieve a 10% net gain.
- A condition was recommended to secure further details and landscaping to address the BNG point.
- Occupants of all 9 houses in Dyson Drive were in favour of the proposal.
- There was a lack of dedicated parking affecting households with young families
- The proposal moved the bays to be alongside existing bays, improving traffic flow and safety.
- The developer supported the application, and the design aimed to blend seamlessly with the existing environment.
- The spaces would not increase the amount of parking or volume of movement, as the cars were already parked informally.
- The proposal was seen as a proactive step towards a balanced and functional

local infrastructure.

- The planting of three trees was included to secure biodiversity net gain.
- Issues with parking big vans and blocking cars led to police complaints.
- The proposal aimed to provide a safer environment for residents, including children.
- It was hoped the application would be viewed favourably by Councillors due to the family size dwellings and parking standards.

Councillors sought clarification regarding the main point of the application and how it could overcome the policy rendering issues. In response, the agent / applicants highlighted the existing highway safety issues, including refuse access difficulties due to informal on-street car parking. Members were informed that the current arrangements failed to provide safe access for refuse vehicles and pedestrians. The scheme aimed to move spaces currently causing safety issues to safer locations. Concerns about anti-social behaviour were also raised.

In response to questions from Members regarding the possibility that installation of the bays could actually result in an increase in the number of cars parking in Dyson Drive, it was suggested that double yellow lines could be installed and measures similar to those in neighbouring roads introduced. It was noted that residents relied on informal car parking arrangements at present.

Councillors asked if the spaces were currently allocated to houses and it was confirmed that they were not. It was mentioned that visitors to the town centre sometimes parked there.

Ward Councillor Reeta Chamdal was in attendance and addressed the Committee in support of petitioners. Key points highlighted included:

- Since the previous year, the residents had positively engaged with the private developers.
- It was clear that there had been an oversight by the previous developers in not allocating sufficient parking spaces in line with the rest of St Andrew's Park.
- All the residents supported the application.
- Most households had at least two cars.
- For busy families with young children, alternative and more sustainable transport options were not always practical.
- The residents were mindful of environmental factors and the impact on green spaces.
- The petitioners proposed to fund the planting of three additional trees.
- They were not asking for a major change to the streetscape, just to bring Dyson Drive in line with Kellett Street, which had two allocated spaces per house.
- The request for additional parking was not an expansion but a formalisation of the current situation.
- Cars were already parked alongside the road and across existing bays.
- By creating proper parking spaces, residents aimed to address road safety and access issues without increasing overall parking pressure.
- The Councillor encouraged the Committee to give serious consideration to the request and suggested a site visit to clarify the situation.
- The Councillor stressed that petitioners sought to formalise the current parking situation into designated spaces.

Councillors raised concerns about the parking space allocation when the houses had been built, noting that only one parking space had been allocated to each house.

Some Members did not find the request unreasonable and noted that, if the proposal were to go ahead, there would still be plenty of greenery. They expressed a willingness to go against officers' recommendations, noting that the proposal appeared to fit well and did not represent a significant change. Caveats such as yellow lines were suggested to prevent parking issues. Concerns regarding the current informal parking situation were raised and restrictions were suggested if the proposal were to go ahead. It was suggested that additional planting could help to address the environmental concerns.

In response to Members' comments, officers confirmed that additional planting could be conditioned but it was noted that the reason for refusal was related to over-provision of parking, not landscaping.

Members sought further clarification regarding the weightage applied when considering policy in the Local Plan and the London Plan. It was explained that the London Plan, adopted in 2021, carried greater weight in decision-making and it was noted that, in the past, appeals had given more weight to the London Plan than to the Local Plan. The Legal Advisor observed that any departure from policy would need to be justified.

The Head of Development Management and Building Control clarified that there had been no oversight in the provision of parking and emphasised the importance of encouraging sustainable modes of travel. Members were reminded that the previous application had been refused due to concerns regarding highway safety and the failure to encourage sustainable travel. Officers highlighted the importance of being satisfied that these concerns had been suitably addressed should the Committee be minded to approve the application. Officers also questioned whether increasing the number of parking spaces would address the problem or whether it would lead to further issues.

Councillors asked for more information on possible restrictions and whether they could be conditioned. It was explained that parking control on private land could not be enforced by the local authority.

The Transport, Planning and Development Team Manager emphasised the importance of adhering to the London Plan's car parking standards to tackle environmental, public health and economic issues. It was noted that, were the application to be approved, this could set a precedent for the entirety of St Andrews Park. The area could potentially become a car park for visitors to the town centre.

Members questioned the weightage given to PTAL values in car parking standards. In response to this, it was clarified that the number of car parking spaces allowed varied according to PTAL rankings.

In response to further questions from Councillors, it was explained that double yellow lines on private roads were enforced by private companies.

At the request of the Committee Members, it was agreed that a decision on the application would be deferred to enable a site visit to take place.

The proposal to defer for a site visit was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED: That a decision on the application be deferred to enable a site visit

	to take place.
29.	<p>41A PARKFIELD ROAD, ICKENHAM - 38629/APP/2024/1155 (<i>Agenda Item 9</i>)</p> <p>Demolition of the existing dwelling and the replacement with a two storey five-bedroom dwelling with associated parking and landscaping</p> <p>Officers introduced the application which was recommended for approval.</p> <p>A petition in objection to the application had been submitted but petitioners were not in attendance. The applicant addressed the Committee Members highlighting the fact that he hoped to increase the size of the property for use as a family home and to accommodate his elderly father. He sought to reassure petitioners that he had no intention of converting the property into an HMO or renting it out on Airbnb.</p> <p>Members observed that the street scene along Parkfield Road was now very mixed since a number of the original bungalows had been rebuilt as larger family homes. It was noted that the intended use of the property in question was a family home, and the applicants had worked well with officers to achieve an acceptable design.</p> <p>Members raised no further concerns. The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the application be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report.</p>
30.	<p>UNIT 4 SILVERDALE INDUSTRIAL ESTATE - 49261/APP/2024/2904 (<i>Agenda Item 10</i>)</p> <p>Demolition of the existing building and structures on site, and all other associated site clearance works. Construction of a data centre building (Class B8) with plant at roof level with an emergency generator (1no.) and associated flue (provided within an external compound adjoining the data centre building), sprinkler tank and pumphouse, security guard house, and provision of one kiosk substation and MV Building. The development also comprises the construction of a new access and internal road and circulation areas, footpaths, provision of car and bicycle parking, hard and soft landscaping and other associated works and ancillary site infrastructure (design amendment reconsultation 10.02.25 including increasing parapet height by 1.54m)</p> <p>Officers introduced the application and highlighted the information in the addendum. It was noted that there had been no objections from neighbours and the application was recommended for approval.</p> <p>In response to questions from Members, it was confirmed that solar panels would be installed at the site.</p> <p>Given the proximity of the mosque to the application site, Councillors requested an amendment to the construction management plan to minimise disruption to attendees during hours of worship.</p> <p>The Committee welcomed the application which would make good use of an empty building. The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote,</p>

	<p>unanimously agreed.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the application be approved subject to the addendum, the conditions set out in the report and an amendment to the construction management plan to minimise disruption to attendees at the nearby mosque during hours of worship.</p>
31.	<p>27-29 WILTSHIRE LANE, EASTCOTE (<i>Agenda Item 11</i>)</p> <p>Proposed demolition of the existing block of 3 garages, conversion of the existing locally listed flatted house into 2 houses with single storey rear extension, new dropped kerb and all associated parking provision and external works.</p> <p>Officers presented the application and highlighted the information in the addendum. The application was recommended for approval.</p> <p>Members welcomed the application noting that it was a good use of the land and would provide much needed family-sized housing in the Borough.</p> <p>No concerns were raised. The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the application be approved subject to the addendum and the conditions set out in the report.</p>
	<p>The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 8.40 pm.</p>

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. Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.